

# The Classical Review

MAY 1893.

## THE STRANGE HISTORY OF A FLAMEN DIALIS.

(NOTE ON LIVY XXVII. 8.)

THIS chapter of Livy has been frequently quoted in connexion with the *Curio Maximus* as well as with the *Flamen Dialis*: but both historians and antiquarians seem to have let another matter of real interest escape their notice. This is a singular bit of family history, which seems to me to deserve attention as illustrating the Roman life and manners of the age as well as the decay of a once important Roman priesthood.

Livy here interrupts his narrative of the war with Hannibal, before proceeding to the events which led to the battle of the Metaurus, to record one or two events of minor importance which might very well in the Augustan age have had a real interest for some of his readers, including, as we may conjecture, Augustus himself. His information came no doubt, directly or indirectly, from the books of the pontifices, and may be taken as representing the facts accurately so far as the priesthoods are concerned. It may indeed have been supplemented from the work of Valerius Antias, as the family prominent in the story is that of the Valerii Flacci; but Livy had by this time learnt to distrust Antias, and the singularity of the story itself and the fact that it is not entirely to the credit of that eminent family lead me to think it in any case worthy of belief. And, as we shall see, it is incidentally confirmed by subsequent events which cannot be called in question.

NO. LX. VOL. VII.

After briefly narrating the first election of a plebeian to the office of *Curio Maximus*, Livy goes on to tell us that at this same time, at the beginning of 209 B.C., a young man, C. Valerius Flaccus by name, was compelled by the Pontifex Maximus against his will to be inaugurated as Flamen Dialis. The inauguratio was the final ceremony in the process of appointment, and it was here apparently that the unwilling youth made some kind of struggle to escape. He had been previously 'captus a pontifice maximo,' i.e. selected out of a certain number of persons nominated (Tac. *Ann.* iv. 16), and brought by a kind of *mancipatio* under the *potestas* of the Pontifex. The coercive power of the head of the Roman religion,—a power which at one time must have belonged to the Rex,—is now brought to bear on the reluctant one to compel him to be inaugurated.

One can understand that a young man may have been unwilling to fill a priesthood which brought him no political advantages, and in fact placed him under many disabilities which in our eyes at least are highly ludicrous; but it is not so easy to see why he should have been forced into it against his will. Livy however supplies us with the explanation, and a most extraordinary one it is; so strange in fact that he says he would have preferred to suppress it, 'ni ex mala fama in bonam vertisset'; words in which we may perhaps see a kind of apology to Augustus for mentioning a circumstance

which would naturally give pain to that rigid moralist, now engaged in resuscitating this as well as other ancient sacrificial priesthoods. This young man was selected by the Pontifex on account of his loose life,—‘ob adulescentiam negligentem luxuriosamque.’

This is sufficiently puzzling; but fortunately Livy adds a few words which seem to me to let us into the whole secret, words of which no one seems to have caught the full meaning. At the end of the sentence we are told the youth was ‘L. Flacco fratri germano cognatisque aliis ob eadem vitia invisus.’ In other words, he was the black sheep of a great Roman family of the best type; for this brother was no less a person than the friend and discoverer of M. Porcius Cato, who afterwards had that still more eminent man as his colleague in both consulship and censorship.<sup>1</sup> It was a disgrace to such a family that at a time of great public peril and anxiety any of its members should be indulging in idle and luxurious habits, even if there were nothing worse to be laid to his charge. Clearly he was not fit for a public career, and must be prevented from embarking on it. His elder brother therefore and the rest of the family conspired to shut him away in the monastic life of the Flamen Dialis, where he could not very well do any harm, and might conceivably come to some good.

The extraordinary series of taboos which were placed upon the holder of this priesthood are familiar to scholars, and I need not detail them here: the more so as Mr. Frazer has done full justice to them in *The Golden Bough*, while explaining their original object and meaning.<sup>2</sup> One restriction however he has not mentioned, which is of importance to us in trying to understand this strange case of Flaccus. *The Flamen Dialis was not allowed to leave his house for a single night during the year.*<sup>3</sup> He was so precious a personage, in early times at least, that he had to be most carefully guarded and looked after; and when as time went on the real meaning of all his disabilities had vanished, the outward forms of them survived and made the post a very uncomfortable one to hold. For further explanations I must refer the curious to Mr. Frazer; but I have said enough to show why Flaccus was disposed to kick, and why his family were so anxious to circumvent him. It is not im-

<sup>1</sup> This is proved by Livy xxxi. 49 and 50; cf. xxxiii. 42.

<sup>2</sup> *Golden Bough*, vol. i. ch. 2, section 1.

<sup>3</sup> Livy v. 52, 13. Even after Augustus' revival, the restriction was almost as severe; Tac. *Ann.* iii. 71.

possible that this priesthood had already been used for the same purpose; for Livy a few lines further on mentions the fact that the ‘indignitas’ of recent flamines had deprived them of the privilege of attending meetings of the senate, which had formerly attached to the office. And here one naturally thinks of the story told by Velleius and Suetonius, that Julius Caesar when very young was destined by his friends to be Flamen Dialis, which would chime in well enough with a certain saying of Sulla's about him, if we were to explain it in the same way in which Livy explains the fate of Flaccus. On the other hand, it may be that the rigid rules for the life of the Flamen had by that time become so much relaxed as to destroy its monastic character. It was certainly at that time possible to hold it together with a magistracy.<sup>4</sup>

This strange story shows that there was no necessary connexion between religious office at Rome and a good or decent life, at the time of the Hannibalic war. But the sequel, which is almost as strange, also seems to show that the *religio* of the Romans might not be without its influence on life even at so late a date as this. Livy goes on to say that this young reprobate, when once his mind came to be occupied with the ‘cura sacrorum et caerimoniarum,’ speedily became repentant. He put off his former evil ways, and took a leading place for virtue among the youth of his day, being highly approved of by the weightiest men in the Senate,—and not only by those of his own kin. Encouraged by the confidence placed in him, he even ventured to claim the old privilege of admission to the Senate. Here however he met with a rebuff: the presiding Praetor (the consuls being apparently outside the city with their troops) turned him out of the Curia. With a common sense worthy of a Roman and a praetor, yet a little surprising in those days, he argued ‘non exoletis vetustate exemplis stare ius’; words from which we may infer that the priesthood had even then long begun to sink into insignificance. Flaccus at once called on the Tribunes to support him, and here the Tribunate accurately represents the popular feeling of what was due to so signal an example of repentance. Amid the applause of Senate and people they brought him back to the Senate-house, and the Praetor himself offered no further opposition.

We are able to trace the history of this

<sup>4</sup> Caesar's predecessor in the priesthood, Merula, had been also consul; see Drumann, iii. 130.

man for a quarter of a century after the events recorded in this chapter. He seems to have retained his character for 'sanctitas vitae,' for in the year 200 B.C. he was elected curule aedile.<sup>1</sup> On this occasion a difficulty occurred. One of the taboos on the Flamen was that he might not take an oath; but every magistrate must 'iurare in leges' within five days of his entering on office.<sup>2</sup> The way in which the difficulty was overcome is very characteristic of the harmonious working of the constitution at that time. Flaccus asked the Senate to absolve him from the law; and the Senate resolved that if he could find some one to take the oath for him, the Consuls should be commissioned to use their influence with the Tribunes to get the matter submitted to the plebs. The same elder brother, now *praetor designatus*, who had nine years earlier been instrumental in forcing him into the priesthood, now took the oath for him; and the plebs sanctioned the whole transaction, which may be compared with familiar instances of legal fictions. Sixteen years later Flaccus was a candidate for a praetorship accidentally vacant, and narrowly missed election.<sup>3</sup> Several points of interest suggest themselves in connexion with this story; I must be content with noticing two.

First the words 'cura sacrorum et caeremoniarum' exactly represent the true character of the old Roman *religio*. For the agricultural and fighting Roman of early times, this *cura* was the one force daily binding his conscience. By the time of the second Punic war the bond had already become relaxed among the higher classes of Roman society; but this incident exactly marks a time when it was still possible, by enforcing attention to ceremonial of an exaggerated kind, to renew the old conscientiousness. No wonder it was seized on by Livy at the time of Augustan religious revival, or that it was copied from Livy by Valerius Maximus,<sup>4</sup> and so no doubt became a popular story. It was exactly this *cura* that Augustus wished to resuscitate in men's minds; and though among the educated it could have done little more than the revival of mediaeval ritual can do with men of to-day, with the masses his skilful adaptation of it to the circumstances

of his age may for a time have partially succeeded.

Secondly, a word about the history of this priesthood. In writing on the Vestals for the new edition of the *Dictionary of Antiquities*, I hinted that as the Vestals may be now regarded as originally the daughters of the king or chief, so the Flamines may have been his sons. Of the other 'kindlers' we know very little, but in the case of the *Dialis* the analogy with the Vestals is too strong to be disregarded. The method of selection is the same in each case, and so also is the subjection to the *potestas* of the Pontifex Maximus (here supplying the place of the Rex); the rigidity of rule, the secluded life, and the inability to take an oath, are likewise characteristic of both priesthoods.<sup>5</sup> The immense importance of the Flamen *Dialis* to the State in the earliest times has been effectually proved by Mr. Frazer in his examination of 'royal and priestly taboos'; and it would be quite natural that such a priesthood should be held by a member of the kingly family. In one sense indeed it always remained a royal priesthood; for from this chapter of Livy we learn that the Flamen *Dialis* had not only the *toga praetexta* but also the *sella curulis*,<sup>6</sup> like those magistrates whose power descended directly from the Rex. But the good sense of the Romans gradually disentangled their political forms from the fossilizing influences of primitive superstition; and it was perhaps one of the first steps in this direction when the Rex was empowered to choose as priest of Jupiter some person outside his family. Such a person must however be still in the safe keeping of the Rex, and absolutely devoted to the service of the god, or the community might meet with serious disaster; hence the use of the *ius coercionis*, and the subjection to the *potestas* of the king, and afterwards to that of the Pontifex Maximus. These forms survived long after their meaning had vanished from men's minds; and we can still faintly trace their decay under the later Republic, as for instance in the claim to appeal to the people against the coercive power of the Pontifex,—an appeal which in one case at least seems to have been successful.<sup>7</sup>

W. W. FOWLER.

<sup>1</sup> Livy xxxi. 50.

<sup>2</sup> See also the *Lex incerta reperta Bantiae*, lines 16, 17.

<sup>3</sup> Livy xxxix. 39; a chapter worth attentive study for other reasons. The identity of the C. Valerius Flaccus here mentioned seems to be established; Livy expressly says that he was Flamen *Dialis*.

<sup>4</sup> Val. Max. vi. 9, 2.

<sup>5</sup> For full details, see Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung* (ed. Wissowa), iii. 328, 336 foll.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.* 113.

<sup>7</sup> Livy xl. 42; on this occasion the tribes decided in favour of the Pontifex Maximus. A mutilated passage in Festus (p. 343) seems to show that the appeal might be successful. See Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, i. 2<sup>e</sup>, 30 note.

## JUROR-PANELS AT ATHENS.

It should be observed that the description given in my former article of the mode of constituting an Athenian law court differs *toto caelo* from the views hitherto current. According to the doctrine contained in the last edition of the work by Meier, Schoemann, and Lipsius on Attic Procedure, each court was permanently assigned to a given magistrate and the causes under his jurisdiction. These writers know nothing of Sections as distinct from Divisions; and suppose that each Division formed the juror-panel of a given court. In the fourth century B.C. the assignment was supposed to take place day by day, in the fifth century year by year. This conception must now be abandoned. Indeed, that it should ever have been thought possible that the fragile virtue of the Athenian juror was left exposed so entirely without protection to the wiles of corruptors like Anytus, ch. 27, may excite our wonder.

Before dismissing the subject, a passage in the *Ecclesiastusae*, which mentions τὰ κληρωτήρια and τὰ γράμματα, will repay examination:—

B. τὰ δὲ κληρωτήρια ποῖ τρέψεις; II. εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν καταθήσω,  
 κᾶτα στήσασα παρ' Ἀρμόδιῳ κληρώσω πάντας,  
 ἕως ἂν  
 εἶδῃς ὁ λαχὼν ἀπὶ γαίρων ἐν ὅποιῳ γράμματι  
 δευπνεί.  
 καὶ κηρύξει τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ βῆτ' ἐπὶ τὴν στοιὰν  
 ἀκολουθεῖν  
 τὴν βασιλῆιον δευπνήσοντας, τὸ δὲ θῆτ' ἐς τὴν  
 παρὰ ταύτην,  
 τοὺς δ' ἐκ τοῦ κάππ' ἐς τὴν στοιὰν χωρεῖν τὴν  
 ἀλφειόπωλιν.  
 B. ἵνα κάπτωσιν; II. μὰ Δι', ἀλλ' ἵν' ἐκεῖ  
 δευπνώσιν. B. ὅτῳ δὲ τὸ γράμμα  
 μὴ' ἐλκυσθῇ καθ' ὃ δευπνήσει, τούτους ἀπελῶσιν  
 ἅπαντες;  
 II. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔσται τοῦτο παρ' ἡμῖν,  
 πᾶσι γὰρ ἀφθονα πάντα παρέξομεν.

The words καταθήσω and στήσασα seem to show that κληρωτήριον was a thing that could be taken down, folded up, removed, deposited, and re-erected like a tent or a booth: and, notwithstanding the hesitating statement of Pollux, it is permissible to doubt whether κληρωτήριον was ever used to signify a balloting-urn (κληρωτήρις). It may be objected that if the balloting in Praxagora's Utopia was to be as simple a thing as

will be presently described, ten assembly-rooms were hardly required. They could indeed only serve the purpose of shelters or waiting-rooms or a rendezvous to hear the result of the ballot. This would be a decline in their importance, which, however, may not have given much trouble to the mind of the comic poet. There would have been still less employment for 20 balloting-urns.

Of the process by which letters were assigned to the courts in the operation described as No. 1 in my former article we have no record. Two ways at once occur by which the thing may have been done. Suppose that ten courts were available and that only three were wanted: then (1) the archons might *choose* the three most convenient courts, and, casting their names into one vessel, and three balls inscribed with the letters *L, M, N*, into another, assign by the mode of simultaneous drawing each letter to a court or each court to a letter. (2) But there might exist some democratic motive for depriving the archons of all choice in the matter and leaving it to be wholly decided by the arbitration of chance. Then one vessel might contain the names of all the ten courts, and another seven blank balls and three inscribed with letters. Conjunction of a name with a lettered ball (ὅτῳ (red, green, new, &c.) τὸ γράμμα (*L, M, N*) ἐλκυσθῇ) would then determine both what courts were to be occupied and what letters were to be their eponyms. If this method was in the mind of Aristophanes, it explains the expression: ὅτῳ δὲ τὸ γράμμα μὴ' ἐλκυσθῇ καθ' ὃ δευπνήσει. In the Utopia of Praxagora the men were to dine in their juror brigades, *A, B, C*, &c., and the only question was, where each brigade should find its banquet. Accordingly the dining-halls were intended by Praxagora to be balloted for by the brigades. But Blepyrus has not quite realized that no brigade is to be dinnerless (κληρώσω πάντας); and just as all the courts (new, green, red, &c.) in the supposed process No. 2 ballot (if the expression is permissible) for letters, though, if all are not wanted, some will draw blanks: so Blepyrus assumes that though all the brigades ballot, some will fail to draw a letter that would assure a feast. The letter here, then, that fails to be drawn is not *A, B, C*, &c., as Dr. Sandys suggests, but *L, M, N*, &c. *A, B, C*, &c., on



this occasion would have to be drawn from one of the vessels, but their companion balls might be blank and exclude from the revelry.

It is obvious that in the preceding lines the expression *ἐν ὁποῖω γράμματι δεικνύει* refers to a letter of the last part of the alphabet.

The messing together of the permanent brigades in Utopia may have contributed to the belief that each brigade formed the juror-panel of a law court in Athens.

E. POSTE.

#### ON THE PSEUDO-CICERONIAN *CONSOLATIO*.

IN the last number of the *Classical Review* I have stated my doubts as to the prevailing belief that the so-called *Consolatio* was a forgery by Sigonius. The work was first printed at Venice in 1583, with no remarks of any kind. In 1584 Sigonius printed two *Orationes* defending it as the genuine work of Cicero. In April of the following year Latinus Latinus (*Epist.* vol. ii. p. 188), in a letter written from Rome, says he had been informed that Sigonius had confessed on his death-bed that he had forged the work, and asks whether the information is true. Death-bed confessions of this kind are very suspicious; the high character of Sigonius as a scholar appears to me a strong *a priori* argument against our attaching more weight to this than to other similar confessions.

As far back as 1432 there was extant at Perugia a *Consolatio*, which Ambrosio Traversari discovered there when visiting that city at the end of May in the double capacity of inspector of monasteries and investigator of lost Greek or Latin works. In his *Hodoeporicon*, a copy of which, printed in the 17th century, is in the Bodleian, he gives an account of his visit to Perugia as follows (p. 11): I. itaque die Viterbium venimus; II. ad Urbem veterem; tertioque Perusiam, ubi a Thoma nostro, Priore S. Trinitatis, gratissime accepti, diem integrum remorati sumus. Inde socius nostri itineris, Abbas Valliscastri, cum bona gratia nostra Fabrianum profectus, deseruit nos. Invenimus illic opusculum de Consolatione, Auctoris ignoti quidem, sed bene eruditi. Id nobis a Priore memorato dono datum, grate accepimus. Profecti Perusia, Arretium venimus.

It seems not impossible that this *Consolatio*, which as described by Traversari very closely corresponds to the editio princeps of 1583 (except that it is there called *M. Tullii Ciceronis Consolatio*), after coming into the possession of Traversari, found its way to Venice, and was the original from which the edition of 1583 was directly or indirectly copied.

This of course opens another question. If the *Consolatio* printed in 1583 was the *Consolatio* read by Traversari in 1432, it can hardly be a *modern* forgery at all: for the style of it is far too classical to have been possible at the beginning of cent. xv.

This pushes back its composition to the third century of the Christian era. For the fragments of what was believed to be the genuine *Consolatio* of Cicero (vol. iv. pp. 989—991 of Baier and Halm's edition, Zurich 1861), all of which are embedded in the Venice *Consolatio* of 1583, are found in Lactantius, whose date is the latter third and early fourth century A.D. But between 45 B.C. and 300 A.D. it is not impossible that the true Ciceronian treatise was lost, and replaced by a spurious one, which Lactantius and after him Augustin and Jerome read as Cicero's, without taking the trouble to examine whether any suspicions attached to it.

Sigonius, indeed, believed that the Venice *Consolatio* was the genuine work of Cicero, and dwells in his two *Orationes* on the natural way in which the Lactantian excerpts reappear in it. In common with most scholars who have studied the question, I find it difficult to ascribe to Cicero a work which seems rather a successful imitation of his style than an adequate reproduction of his treatment and reasoning. I no less feel it to be *in the highest degree improbable* that Sigonius, who, earlier in his career, had edited the fragments of Cicero, and whose interest it could not have been either to lend his name to a forgery or *a fortiori* himself forge a supposed classical work, should have written two discourses upholding its genuineness as Cicero's real *Consolatio*; and almost immediately after the publication of these should have made (1585) a death-bed confession of being himself its author. Nothing in Sigonius' acknowledged writings reminds the reader of Cicero's style: he used a good, but distinctly modern, Latin: and the more he did so, the less chance of his executing such a *tour de force* as this *Consolatio*.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

## ADVERSARIA.

THE corruptions caused by inversion of the order of letters have been well illustrated in various brilliant papers by Mr. Housman. Without being quite so great a believer in the saving grace of anagram, I agree that many such corruptions still lie hidden in our MSS. What has occurred in Herod. i. 82, where (Gaisford's) S gives συλλοχίοντε for συλλοχίτων, or in Eur. *Iph. Aul.* 623, where MSS. have θακείς for καθεύδεις, has doubtless occurred in less obvious instances.

In Pind. *Nem.* v. 43 Mr. Bury reads 'Ισθμοῖ τ' αἶξας ἅντα for ἦτοι μεταίξαντα, adopting 'Ισθμοῖ from Mezger. The correction is, I venture to think, even better than Mr. Bury supposed. He calls ἦτοι a gloss, and derives μεταίξαντα from μοιταίξαντα. Rather η = ιω (v. Cobet, *Nov. Lect.* p. 745), τ = θ (a corruption equally common), and ητοιμετ is an anagram of ητοιμετ = 'Ισθμοῖ τε.

Of this kind of error I propose to correct two instances:—

Herodotus i. 116. ἐπεὶ δὲ ὑπελείπειτο ὁ βουκόλος μῶνος, μουνωθέντα δὲ αὐτὸν εἶρετο ὁ Ἀστυάγης, κόθεν λάβοι τὸν παῖδα.

The MSS. vary between μουνωθένταδὲ, μουνωθέντα τάδε, μουνωθέντα δὲ τάδε, and μούνωθεν τάδε. There is of course no objection to δὲ in apodosis: the objection lies to such an expression as 'when the herdsman was left behind alone, Astyages asked him, being left alone,'....Even the *ubertas* of Herodotus does not cause style to slop over quite like that. The MSS. divergences too are significant. With a view to correction compare (a) i. 126 ὡς δὲ παρήσαν ἅπαντες ἔχοντες τὸ προειρημένον, ἐνθα ὕτα ὁ Κύρος προεῖπε κ.τ.λ. (b) ii. 173 σὲ γὰρ χρῆν ἐν θρόνῳ σε μὲν ᾧ σε μὲν ὃν θωκέοντα κ.τ.λ. (c) ii. 52, where some MSS. give κοσμωνθέντες for κόσμωθέντες. In our passage restore ἐνθ for θεν and read ἐπεὶ δὲ ὑπελείπειτο ὁ βουκόλος μῶνος μούνω, ἐνθα ὕτα δὲ κ.τ.λ.

Euripides, *Medea* 228, 229.

ἐν ᾧ γὰρ ἦν μοι πάντα γινώσκειν καλῶς,  
κάκιστος ἀνδρῶν ἐκβέβηχ οὐμὸς πόσις.

With those who consider this passage sound I feel that I have little common footing. I do not wonder at the actors of whom it is said that, οὐ συμπεριφερόμενοι τῷ τρόπῳ, they substituted γινώσκειν. But

γινώσκειν was a poor makeshift. I am persuaded that Euripides wrote, not ἨΝΜΟΙ, but ΟΙΜΗΝ, and that we should read

ἐν ᾧ γὰρ ᾧ μ' ἦν πάντα γινώσκειν καλῶς,  
'for he in whom I thought I knew all'..... has turned out to be something I did not think.'

[There may be some who will be willing to consider further the claims of κάλων for καλῶς. It is true that 'to know all the ropes' is vulgar English, but it may be very poetical Greek, like so many other nautical metaphors. Cf. πάντα ἐξίεναι κάλων. A Greek sailor who knows every inch of his ship might be said πάντα γινώσκειν κάλων, and there would be nothing awkward in 'transferring' the expression here.]

Clement of Alexandria p. 592.

ἦδη γοῦν αἱ γυναῖκες οὐδὲν ἑλαττον τῶν ἀρρένων καὶ οἱ κ ο ν ρ ο ὦ σ ι καὶ θηρέουσι καὶ τὰς ποίμνας φυλάττουσι.

On this passage Cobet observes (ΛΟΓΙΟΣ ΕΡΜΗΣ 1866, i. 513) πολλὰ μάρτη ζητήσας τὸ ἐν τῷ ΟΙΚΟΥΡΟΥΣΙ κεκρυμμένον τάληθις ἐρευνᾶν καὶ ἀνιχνεύειν ἄλλοις παρέημι. In the *Journal of Philology*, vol. xv. no. 30, Professor J. E. B. Mayor suggests ΑΥΤΟΥΡΟΥΣΙ for ΟΙΚΟΥΡΟΥΣΙ, and, I venture to think, demonstrates the unlikelihood of the correction while enlarging the type. ΑΥΤ is not sufficiently akin to ΟΙΚ on any palaeographic ground. Moreover αὐτουργεῖν is apparently too general a word to suit the θηρέουσι and ποίμνας φυλάττουσι.

Remembering the identity of pronunciation of η and οι, and their constant confusion in almost all MSS., and remembering further that the rare word lends itself most easily to mutilation, I should read οὐδὲν ἑλαττον τῶν ἀρρένων σηκηκοροῦσι καὶ θηρέουσι κ.τ.λ.

σηκηκόρος ('cleanser of the byre,' and then in connected senses) is the later form for the Homeric σηκοκόρος. I feel tolerably certain about σηκηκοροῦσι itself, but am in doubt whether we should still keep καὶ and suppose a genesis of error thus καὶ σηκ(ηκ)οροῦσι, καὶ σοικοροῦσι, καὶ οἰκουροῦσι.

Lucian, *Philopseudes* 21, p. 49.

Antigonus the doctor says that he has a bronze figure of Hippocrates ὅσον πηχυαῖος

τὸ μέγεθος. After the lights are out, this figure walks all about the house and makes havoc in the surgery τὰς πυξίδας ἀνατρέπων καὶ τὰ φάρμακα συγχέων καὶ τὴν θύραν περιτρέπων. To mix the drugs and upset the pill-boxes is, no doubt, a natural enough proceeding for a mischievous mannikin of a foot and a half. But how you turn a door upside down, how a πηχναῖος could do it (granting it feasible), and where the special appropriateness of the fun comes in, I fail to see. I found also that a class of intelligent undergraduates, with notions of fun still keen enough, failed equally. What the mannikin really upset was τὴν θύραν (according to later Greek spelling) or τὴν θυρίαν (as Lucian himself wrote it).

Sophocles, *Antigone* 2, 3.

ἄρ' οἶσθ' ὅ τι Ζεὺς τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπουν κακῶν  
ὑποῖον οὐχὶ νῦν ἔτι ζῶσαν τελεῖ;

It would be needless to travel over the ground of Prof. Jebb's note and appendix. So far as the text and existing conjectures go, his discussion is exhaustive. After much conscientious effort, however, I find it impossible to discover a construction in the text, and therefore venture to add one to the conjectures. The error lies (where no one seems to have looked for it) in Ζεὺς. One might ask in any case—Why Zeus, and not the Fates or the Curse? Apart from that objection, it is the word Ζεὺς which admits of easiest correction. Regarding τελεῖ as intransitive (cf. *Elect.* 1419, Aesch. *Sc T.* 659, *Cho.* 1021, *Pers.* 225), I would read

ἄρ' οἶσθ' ὅ τι ζῇ τῶν ἀπ' Οἰδίπουν κακῶν  
ὁποῖον οὐχὶ νῦν ἔτι ζῶσαν τελεῖ;

'Do you know what ill there yet lives (unspent) of all bequeathed by Oedipus, which will not find fulfilment on us while yet we live?' With ζῇ cf. *Ant.* 457, *O. T.* 482.

ζῇ is antithetic to τελεῖ and is played upon by ζῶσαν.

Sophocles, *Antigone* 4-6.

οὐδὲν γὰρ οὐτ' ἀλγαινὲν οὐτ' ἄτης ἄτερ  
οὐτ' αἰσχρὸν οὐτ' ἀτιμόν ἐσθ', ὁποῖον οὐ  
τῶν σῶν τε κάμων οὐκ ὅπωπ' ἐγὼ κακῶν.

Before I had seen Mr. E. M. Thompson's transcript of οὐτ' ἄτης ἄτερ in Prof. Jebb's appendix, I had convinced myself that οὐτ' ἄτης πέρας was the true reading. That transcript greatly confirms πέρας. There is no doubt that the tragedians deliberately affected rare forms in -ap for poetical tone, and there is equally no doubt that such forms, being unknown to copyists, often caused corruption. In Aesch. *Suppl.* 762 (784 Dind.) I write σκέπαρ and quote μῶμαρ, λῦμαρ, besides the better known ἄλκαρ, μῆχαρ, εἰλαρ, θέναρ, &c. πῆμαρ is common enough.

In point of meaning ἄτης πέρας = 'the ne plus ultra of ἄτη.' Cobet (*Nov. Lect.* pp. 71, 72) gives full illustration of the statement that 'πέρας Graecis est τὸ ἐκαστον ἔσχατον, id quod in quaque re extremum est.' Such expressions as Aelian's 'Ἀπίκιος ἦν ἀσωτίας πέρας are by no means the outcome of late Greek nor of slang.

Sophocles, *Antigone* 392.

ἀλλ' ἡ γὰρ ἐκτὸς καὶ παρ' ἐλπίδας χαρὰ  
ἔοικεν ἀλλῇ μῆκος οὐδὲν ἦδονῃ.

I propose to read καρτανελπίδος for καιπαρ-ελπίδας and emend

ἀλλ' ἡ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ κάρτ' ἀνελπίδος  
χαρὰ

'the joy which cometh after sheer despair.'

T. G. TUCKER.

#### VIRGIL, *ECL.* IV. 60-63.

60. Incipe, parve puer, risu cognoscere matrem;
61. Matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses;
62. Incipe, parve puer, cui non risere parentes,
63. Nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata cubili est.

I do not think that the conjecture *qui.... parenti* in 62 has received the attention it

deserves. It has recently been put forward by Bonnell in his *Quintilian* and is approved by Benoist in his note on the above passage.

(1) Though all MSS. agree in *cui.... parentes*, yet Quintil. (ix. 2, 8) quotes the line with *qui....parentes*. Voss (followed by Conington) supposes that Quintil. found *quoi* in his copy and read it *qui* instead of *cui*. But Quintil. must have meant *qui*,

because it is given as an example of irregularity in the use of number, and one would hesitate to attribute such carelessness to Quintilian in quoting the very word which is the point of the quotation.

(2) A difficulty occurs about the grammar, but if, as Mr. Page remarks, the transition from the plur. *qui* to the sing. *hunc* did not trouble Quintilian it need not trouble us.<sup>1</sup> Anyhow it is no harsher than Homer's

θυμὸς δὲ μέγας ἐστὶ διωτρεφῆων βασιλῆων  
τιμὴ δ' ἐκ Διὸς ἐστὶ, φιλαὶ δὲ ἔμμηττα Ζεὺς

(B 197 and cf. δ 691). Mr. Monro (*H.G.* § 255, 1), quoting these two passages, remarks that 'the change from plural to singular is not unusual in passages of a gnomic character.'

(3) *Parentes* might conceivably stand with *qui*, as in Plaut. *Capt.* 3, 1, 21, but the acc. after *rideo* in the sense required is rare and *parenti* would naturally have been altered to *parentes* when *cui* had supplanted *qui*. Moreover the sing. agrees better with the sing. *matrem* in 60.

(4) It is generally allowed that *qui*... *parenti* makes excellent sense, catching up the thought of *risu cognoscere matrem*, indeed it appears to me to be much more pointed than *cui non risere parentes*. For these reasons then I think the proposed emendation a very probable one.

Does *risu* refer to the smile of the infant or the smile of the mother? Sonntag, in common with several other commentators, understands it of the mother's smile on two grounds: (1) that this meaning accords better with the habits of infants; (2) that it suits the context better. In support of (1) he quotes Pliny's *Nat. Hist.* to the effect that an infant does not smile before his fortieth day, but whatever the literal fact may be, if Virgil chooses to make an infant smile or recognize on the day of his birth he is surely within his rights as a poet. With regard to (2) Sonntag takes *risu* of the mother's smile on the ground that only so taken does it suit the following line, the connexion of thought being that the

mother smiles on the child when it is first brought to her after she has undergone the pain of giving birth, and he adds 'Darum ist auch die Erwähnung des Gegensatzes *matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses* nicht otiosum, wie Forbiger meint, sondern notwendig, weil durch dieselbe die Erwähnung des Lachens motiviert wird.' On the other hand, Conington and Page, following Servius and Wagner, take *risu* of the infant's smile on precisely the same grounds, the connexion of thought then being, 'Greet thy mother with a smile; she needs cheering for she has suffered ten long months.' Whichever meaning we give to *risu* I hold that 62 must agree with it, in other words that 62 catches up and repeats 60. I cannot believe that there is any question of an *answering* smile whether from parents (as Conington and Page) or child (as Kennedy 'The infant's smile is supposed to be enticed by that of his parent, not the mother's by that of the infant'). A further difficulty in the passage is the connexion between the smile (whether of the child or the parents) and the idea of the child thus becoming a favourite of heaven. The last line is usually referred to the Homeric lines on Heracles who μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι τέρεται ἐν θαλίῃ καὶ ἔχα καλλίσφρον' Ἡβην (λ 602), but that explains nothing. Sonntag in accordance with his conception of the whole *Eclogue*, viz., that Virgil is only prophesying a return to the Golden Age conditional on the birth of a certain child, is obliged to take *cui non risere parentes* to mean no more than 'the child who has not managed to be born.' Benoist, following Servius, sees an allusion to Vulcan, of whom his mother Juno was ashamed (cf. Σ 395), and whom Jupiter refused to admit to the table of the gods, while Minerva declined to wed him. This allusion, not in itself improbable, is hardly consistent with his preference for *qui*... *parenti*. No other commentators, as far as I know, have attempted an explanation, and yet one seems required. Perhaps it may be after all merely a high-flown way of expressing an old nurse's saw that a dull infant comes to a bad end.

R. C. SEATON.

#### HERMAS AND THE FOUR GOSPELS.

In the *Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels*, which was noticed in the *Classical Review* vol. vi. 453 (Dec. 1892), I pointed

out what seems to me to be a symbolical allusion to the Four Gospels in the structure of the tower in the ninth *Similitude* of the

<sup>1</sup> A somewhat similar change occurs, Ov. *Tr.* 3, 4, 7,  
*Nam quamquam soli possunt prodessc potentes*  
*Non prosit potius, plurimum obesse potest.*



*Shepherd*. I am indebted to Mr. Rendel Harris for an illustration of this from the pseudo-Cyprianic tract *De montibus Sina et Sion* § 10 'De Sion exiet lex et uerbum Domini ab Hierusalem. Dicit Hierusalem de caelo descendentem nouam civitatem quadratam per Quattuor Evangelia' (Hartel).

The tower is the Church, and its building is the outcome of the preaching of the Gospel. In the foundation are four *στοίχοι*, or tiers, of 10, 25, 35, 40 stones respectively. It is not clear what the numbers signify, but the four tiers are the four 'generations' or ages of the world from its beginning.

The presence of pre-Christian generations in the Church is accounted for by an extension of the idea that Christ went down to Hades and preached *τοῖς κοιμωμένοις*, as the 'Gospel of Peter' has it. In the *Shepherd* the Apostles and others do likewise, *κοιμηθέντες... ἐκήρυξαν καὶ τοῖς προκεκοιμημένοις*. If each of the generations received the *κήρυγμα* in a form specially adapted to its own requirements, the Gospel must have been 'quadriform,' as Irenaeus terms it, meaning that there were Four

Gospels 'of the Apostles,' and no more. The sayings of Irenaeus on the four catholic covenants, given severally to the four ages of humanity, and corresponding to the Four Gospels, agree strikingly with the alleged preaching of the Gospel to the four ages in the *Shepherd of Hermas*. Given that Irenaeus knew the *Shepherd* and quoted it as 'Scripture,' is it likely that the agreement was merely accidental?

In *De montibus Sina et Sion* § 3 'Sion... in quo monte *Spiritus sanctus Filius Dei* rex constitutus est' the Son is spoken of as *Spiritus sanctus* in the manner and probably under the influence of *Hermas*. Compare in Migne on Cyprian *De idololorum vanitate* § 11 the note on 'carnem *Spiritus sanctus* induitur,' where the reading is justified by a parallel from the Latin of *Hermas Sim. v*. It was likely *a priori* that the writer of *De montibus* would know the *Shepherd*, his '*Spiritus sanctus Filius Dei*' suggests that he used it, and we may say that he was perhaps under some further obligation to it for his '*quadrata per Quattuor Evangelia*.'

C. TAYLOR.

#### EMENDATIONS ON TACITUS, *DIALOGUS DE ORATORIBUS*.

Ch. i. 8-9.—*For* excipere ut...existimandum [sil] *read* excipere, erit enim...existimandum.

Ch. ii. 6.—*For* in iudiciis non utrosque modo, *read* non modo in iudiciis utrosque.

Ch. iii. 10.—*For* leges tu quid, or quidem, *read* intelleges tu quidem quid.

Ch. iii. 24.—*For* [ut]...adgregares, *read* adgregando.

Ch. v. 12.—*For* quatenus arbitrum litis huius inveniri, *read* quatenus arbitrum litis huius inveniri contigit.

Ch. v. 13.—*For* apud eos arguam, *read* apud hos arguam.

Ch. vi. 27.—*For* quamquam alia diu serantur atque elaborentur, gratiora tamen, *read* quamquam grata quae diu serantur atque elaborentur, gratiora tamen.

Ch. xxi. 4.—*For* quique alios, *read* quique alii omnes.

Ch. xxii. 23.—*For* olentia, *read* insolentia.

Ch. xxv. 9.—*For* si cominus fatetur, *read* ubi nimirum fatetur.

Ch. xxv. 28.—*For* solitos et invidere et livere, *read* solitos esse invidere et livere.

Ch. xxvi. 13.—*For* frequens sicut his

clam et exclamatio, *read* frequens facietis hominibus exclamatio.

Ch. xxvii. 7.—*For* nam nec vos (or nam et vos) offendi decebit, *read* nec nunc vos offendi decebit.

Ch. xxxi. 32.—*For* Stoicorum\* citeam, *read* Stoicorum divitem.

Ch. xxxii. 16.—*For* ius civitatis, *read* ius huius civitatis.

Ch. xxxvii. 39.—*For* quorum ea natura est ut secreta velint, *read* quorum ea natura est ut secreta vellicent.

Ch. xxxviii. 2.—*For* quae etsi nunc aptior est ita erit eloquentiam tamen, *read* quae etsi nunc aptior est, veterum eloquentiam tamen.

Ch. xxxix. 12.—*For* probationibus et testibus silentium patronus indicit, *read* probationibus et testibus audiendis silentium patronus indicit.

Ch. xl. 11.—*For* sine obsequio, sine veritate *read* sine obsequio, sine reverentia.

Ch. xli. 23.—*For* ac deus aliquis vitas ac vestra tempora repente mutasset, *read* ac deus aliquis vitas vestras ac vetera tempora repente mutasset.

W. PETERSON.

## THE PROSPECTIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.—A REPLY.

I AM far from wishing to insist upon the originality of any of the views that I expressed in my recent article on the 'Prospective Subjunctive' (*C. R.*, Feb. 1893). In a certain sense all grammarians say the same thing; all are attempting to find some formula more or less adequate to express certain facts familiar to the advanced scholar. The object of my article was to draw a distinction which has been commonly ignored by grammarians and commentators, and to subsume certain instances of the Subjunctive under the category of the Prospective, *i.e.* the relatively future. Mr. W. R. Inge (*C. R.*, April, 1893) is 'at a loss to know wherein the discovery consists.' That he regards my general statements as self-evident is a matter of great satisfaction to me; but any undue complacency is dispelled by his criticism of my instances, in which he expresses his *disagreement* with most of my interpretations. I am therefore driven back upon the supposition that there *was* something new, though perhaps not true, in what I wrote. Thus in regard to Hor. Ep. I. 20, 10 *carus eris Romae donec te deserat aetas*, Mr. Inge believes the Subj. to be 'impossible in Horace,' and calls it 'post-Augustan.' If so, then I am guilty of error, not platitude. [Perhaps, however, Mr. Inge will modify his opinion when he reflects that the Future Indicative, which he proposes to substitute for the reading of the archetype, is extremely rare in the classical period with words meaning 'until'; I believe there is no example with *donec* in Horace or in classical prose; whereas the Pres. Subj., which, as I contend, took the place of the Fut. Indic. in expressing futurity from the point of view of the present, is used by Horace in Ep. I. 16, 23 *donec manibus tremor incidat unctis*, Epod. 17, 34 *donec...ferar* (which must be regarded as Subj. till instances of the Fut. Indic. are forthcoming), Ep. I. 18, 64 *donec alterutrum velox victoria fronde coronet*, and A. P. 155 *sessuri donec cantor....dicat*; the latter two are quoted by Prof. Wilkins, who adopts *deserat* in his note on Ep. I. 20, 10, though he has *deseret* in the text, apparently by a misprint. According to my view all these Subjunctives are prospective simply.]

As to Conditional Sentences, the points in my treatment which I have not seen in any previous writer<sup>1</sup> are (i) the treatment of

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Inge says that 'the true view, clearly expounded by Prof. Sonnenschein in this *Review* in

sentences like *si negem mentiar*, (ii) the denial of anacoluthon in sentences like *si fractus illabatur orbis, impavidum ferient ruinae*. In regard to sentences with two Indicatives and with two past tenses of the Subjunctive in Latin, I have never claimed to have made any advance upon commonly received doctrines; though even on these points grammarians are not so universally agreed as Mr. Inge supposes.<sup>2</sup> It is curious to read in the *Eton Latin Grammar*, of which Mr. Inge is joint author (2nd ed. 1890, p. 314): 'An impossible hypothesis...is sometimes rhetorically regarded as possible, and so (!) referred to Future Time'—precisely the statement to which I objected, and which, according to Mr. Inge in the *Classical Review*, 'has long since faded into the limbo of exploded grammatical heresies.'

I must not attempt to re-discuss the particular passages on which I originally commented. But there is one point which perhaps I ought to have stated more explicitly, as I think it has caused Mr. Inge to misunderstand me. I do not in the least deny the familiar idiom in which the Indicative is used for the Subjunctive in expressions of possibility, right, duty, etc. I fully recognized them in my *Grammar* (§ 356), published in 1889. But what I do maintain is that not every instance in which the Indicative of *possum, debeo*, etc. is found is 'uno ordine habendus.' Thus in *si vivere vellet, Seianus rogandus erat* means not 'if he wanted to live [implying that he does not!], he would have to address his entreaties to Sejanus,' but 'if he wanted to live [implying merely 'I do not say that he did'], he had to address...,' as in Shakspeare 'If it were so, it was a grievous fault.' Such sentences are quite different from *emendaturus, si licuisset, eram* 'I should have amended, if I had been allowed,' or *si verum respondere velles, haec erant dicenda*. The context alone can decide upon the correct rendering of such sentences. *Sic flendus Peleus, si moreretur, erat* seems to me to 1887, was taught me by Mr. A. H. Cooke at Cambridge many years before.' This I could not be expected to know. But if I was anticipated in my treatment of the above points by Mr. Cooke, I can at least be unfeignedly glad to know that the matter has presented itself to another mind in the same light as to me.

<sup>2</sup> Witness recent discussions in the *Classical Review*. Even in this year of grace the Germans talk of a *Realer Fall* (Scheidler, *Lat. Gram.*, 2nd ed.), and Gentsch thinks it necessary to protest in a recent Jena dissertation.

belong to the former class (not, as Mr. Hallam and Mr. Roby in Sch. Lat. Gr. p. 394, 'Such would have been the mourning for Peleus, if he had been dying'). Mr. Inge's question 'how can *si moreretur* mean "should he die," after the past verb *stabat*?' is unintelligible to me: if there had been any other than a past tense, I could have understood his difficulty. The lines run *Stabat, ut ante patrem, lacrimis perfusus Achilles; Sic flendus* etc. 'Achilles stood bathed in tears, as before his father; thus was Peleus to be mourned (or 'would P. have to be mourned'), should he die.' My reason for rejecting the other translation was not so much that we should expect *fuit* for *erat*,<sup>1</sup> as that the sense so arrived at seems less suitable.

<sup>1</sup> I did not deny that the Imperf. may refer to past time (= 'it would have been'); I only meant that the Perfect is more common in such cases. Does Mr. Inge deny this? See Madvig (Eng. Transl. 5th ed.) § 548 e, with Obs. 1, and the instances in Dräger<sup>2</sup> § 550 and § 140 b—d. I have recognized both *eram* and *fui* in my Grammar, p. 142, as legitimate in past time.

Similarly Plaut. Bacch. 563 *Quid? tibi non erat aliarum Athenis copia, nisi eam occiperes amare* (the exact reading is doubtful) means 'What? were there not plenty of other women for you at Athens, without falling in love with her?'; a sentence precisely analogous in past time to Cicero's *si non possim dicere, quid habet admirationis?* (present time). My point is that these contain *open*, not *rejected*, conditions.

Longum est ad omnia respondere. The above explanations will perhaps suffice. I will content myself with one further remark. That 'the Imperf. Subj. in *Consecutive* Clauses [always] denotes an action future in the past,' may be 'known to every school-boy,' but is not known to me. (See note 1 of my article.)<sup>2</sup>

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

<sup>2</sup> I avail myself of the opportunity of correcting two misprints in my article: (i) p. 9, col. 1, l. 41 *Ego* (for *Ergo*); (ii) p. 10, col. 2, l. 42 '*reported* (for *repeated*) without obliquity.'

#### HERODAS ii. 75 (Kenyon):

και Βάτταρος μοι τουνονμ εστι

Cf. Plutarch, *Quomodo Adolescens Poetas Audire Debeat* 18 C οὕτως ὁ νέος ἀναγκασκων ἂν Θερσίτης ὁ γελοιοποιὸς ἢ Σίσυφος ὁ φθορεὺς ἢ Βάτραχος ὁ πορνοβοσκὸς λέγων ἢ πρῶτων πεποιήται, διδασκείσθω τὴν μνημονεύνην ταῦτα δύναμιν καὶ τέχνην ἐπαινέιν κ.τ.λ., and correct Βάτραχος into Βάτταρος or *vice versa*.

Aristotle *N. E.* 1144a 27 τοὺς φρονίμους δεινούς καὶ πανούργους φημὲν εἶναι. Sense can only be made of this passage if *πανούργους* be taken as a term of praise, which editors hesitate to do. But cf. Plutarch 27 F μάλιστα δὲ τοῦτο δεῖ ποιεῖν ἐν ταῖς τραγωδαῖς, ὅσαι λόγους ἔχουσι πιθανοὺς καὶ πανούργους ἐν πράξεσιν ἀδόξους καὶ πονηραίς, and 28 A μηδὲν οὖν τούτων κομψὸν ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ πανούργον ὁ νέος ἐθιζέσθω.

Xen. *Hell.* iv. 3, 17, *ἔτρεψαν τὸ καθ' αὐτοὺς*, and *Anab.* i. 8, 24 *ἔτρεψε τοὺς ἐξακισχιλίους*. As the 1 Aor. Med. is commonly used rather than the Active in this sense, it seems probable that we have examples of hemigraphy in these passages, *ετρεψαντο* for *ετρεψαντοτο*, and *ετρεψατοὺς* (corrected into *ἔτρεψε τοὺς*) for *ετρεψατοτοὺς*.

F. B. JEVONS.

#### ON MARTIAL iii. 46, 5.

This line appears in the MSS. as

In turbam incideris, cunctos umbone repellat:

Turnebus and Heinsius suggest 'cuneos,' which is adopted by Schneidewin in his last edition and also by Paley and Stone, who say that it is intended to keep up the metaphor in 'umbone.' But why should not 'umbo' here mean the footpath, as it does in Stat. *Silv.* iv. 3. 47?

In this passage of Statius some take 'umbones' to mean the kerb-stones: either translation would suit the line of Martial.

S. B. SLACK.

\* \*

#### ON STATIUS *Theb.* x. 527.

This passage appears in most MSS. as follows:—

trabibusque artata sonora  
pellunt saxa loco.

Most editors adopt this with the substitution of 'sonoris' for 'sonoro': 'artata' then will have the sense 'beaten,' which it can hardly perhaps bear. Moreover we have still to account for the reading of the

most important MS. of Statius, the Codex Puteaneus, which has

trabibus et ariete sonoro.

Mr. R. Ellis suggests to me that the correct reading is:—

trabibusque arietata sonoris,

and for the quantity of 'arietata' he compares *Theb.* ii. 492:—

celsum crebris arietatibus urbis  
inclinare latus,

where however 'arietatibus' is only a conjecture of Gruter, though a very probable one, for arietibus. Other suggestions are 'trabibusque atque ariete moto' (Baehrens) 'trabibusque aut aere sonoro' (Kohlmann). Sandstroem reads 'trabibusque artata sonora pellunt saxa lyra,' alluding to the story of Amphion. This seems the right idea, but the order is rather against his reading. I propose

fidibusque artata sonoris  
pellunt saxa loco.

It is well known that our MSS. represent two different texts of Statius and I suppose that here the MS. reading may have arisen from confusion with another reading which may have been:—

trabibusque atque ariete crebro

or something of that sort. This would explain the 'trabibus' and the termination of 'sonoro.' These confusions of the two texts confront us elsewhere: for example, in xi. 45 the two classes of MSS. have respectively 'procumbit' and 'expirat' but one of them has (originally) 'proexpirat.' I should add that Mr. Ellis compares for arietata the scansion of 'tenuior' in such lines as:—

Ortus et instantem cornu tenuiore videbat  
(*Theb.* xii. 2).

Possibly however this is intended to be read 'tēnyvōre' rather than 'tēnuīōre.

S. B. S.

\* \*

In his article on the 'Elision of the Dative Iota in Attic Tragedy' Mr. Brennan rejects Lobeck's emendation of *κατατομῶν* for *κατατόμῳ* in *Alc.* 1118 on the ground that it reflects on the courage of Perseus. The emendation occurred to me years ago when reading the *Alcestis* with boys, and I sent it off to Mr. Shilleto at once, only to find that Lobeck had preceded me. Surely the attitude of Admetus is the point of the comparison. He is unwilling to look at the stranger for fear he should be attracted by her beauty and so even for a moment false to his wife's memory; and in thus standing with hand outstretched but averted face, he is like Perseus, who dares not with all his courage look at the features which turned beholders into stone.

E. D. S.

\* \*

'Αθ. πολ., C. 49 l. 4. Mr. B. Lacon, of Athens, wishes to propose an emendation of this passage. In place of the corrupt

<sup>Λ Λ</sup>  
M.S. ΑΝΑΓΟΥΣΙ he would substitute ΗΛΑΚΤΙΖΟΥΣΙ, in support of which he quotes Xen. *De Mag. Eq.* 1, 4, καὶ οἱ λακτίζοντες δὲ ἀναβεβαμένοι ἵπποι ἐκποδῶν ποιητοί, *ib.* 1, 15, ἀγαθὸν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἱππασίαις λακτίζοντας ἵππους προρρηθῆναι ὅτι ἀποδοκιμασθήσονται, *Mem.* iii. 3, 4 ἐν οὖν, ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης, παρέχονται σοὶ τοὺς ἵππους.....οἱ δ' οὕτω λακτιστὰς ὥστε μὴδὲ τάξαι δυνατόν εἶναι. This emendation is sent to the *Classical Review* in accordance with Mr. Lacon's request.

F. G. K.

#### LEXICOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

ἐπ' ἄκρα βαίνειν (to walk on tiptoe). Poseidippus (To a Statue of Time). Cf. ἐπ' ἄκρων of Sophocles &c.

ἀνμύθην. Aor. pass. of ἀνμύω (draw up). Appian (*Mithridatica*, 32):—ἀποκλεισθεὶς ἀνμύθη διὰ καλῶδίων.

ἀπορνεοῖν (to change into a bird). Used in the active voice by Apollodorus (i. 7, 4):—Ζεὺς δὲ αὐτοὺς ἀπορνήσκει, καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀλκίονα ἐποίησε, τὸν δὲ κήκη.

ἀθάνατος (used of soldiers). Dio Cassius (52, 27). Maecenas is made to say:—τοὺς δὲ δὴ στρατιώτας ἀθανάτους τρέφεσθαι προσήκει (It was necessary for Augustus to have an army, the number of which should be fixed, and not allowed to fluctuate.) Cf. Herod. vii. 83 of the Persian 'Immortals.'

διουστρέω is used in the active voice by Theodoridas *apud Athenaeum* p. 302 c:—θύννοι τε διουστρήσονται Γαδείρων δρόμον.



ἐκπτώσις. In Arrian (*Epictetus* ii. 17, 21) ἐκπτώσις ψυχῆς means aberration of mind. εἰανξής (elastic, elongating). Aristotle (*Hist. of An.* i. 13, 4):—τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν μέρος χονδρῶδες, εἰανξές, καὶ ἐξέρχεται καὶ εἰσέρχεται. L. and S. are wrong in giving the meaning of quick-growing to the word here.

ἡμιστράγαλος (having half an ankle). Aristotle (*Hist. of An.* ii. 1, 33):—ἡ μὲν λυγὴ ὁμοίον ἡμιστράγαλῳ. L. and S. do not recognize this reading.

ἐν τῷ καθόλου (on the whole). Athenaeus p. 30 e. See Casaubon's note. Cf. Arrian (*Epictetus* i. 8, 8, et passim).

κρίθινος = ἀγροικός (rustic). Hermogenes p. 384 (speaking of Dinarchus):—ὥστ' ἤδη τινὲς καὶ προσπαίζοντες αὐτὸν οὐκ ἀχαρίτως κρίθινον Δημοσθένην εἰρήκασιν. Cf. Dionysius (*de Dinarcho*, c. 8):—δι' αὐτὸ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ ἀγροικὸν τινες Δημοσθένην αὐτὸν ἔφασαν εἶναι.

κυφή (a kind of shrimp). Aristotle (*Hist. of Animals* iv. 2):—τῶν μὲν γὰρ καρδίων αἷ τε κυφαὶ καὶ αἱ κραγγόνες καὶ τὸ μικρὸν γένος· αἷται γὰρ οὐ γίνονται μείζους. (Not in L. and S.)

ὡς ἐν μάλιστα. Plato to Archytas (*apud Diogenem* viii. 81):—τὰ μὲν παρὰ σοῦ ἐλθόντα ὑπομνήματα θαυμαστῶς ὡς ἀσμενοὶ τ' ἐλάβομεν καὶ τοῦ γράψαντος αὐτὰ ἡγάσθημεν ὡς ἐνι μάλιστα. Cf. Xenophon's ὡς ἐνι ᾧδιτα.

οἶον = quasi (with a noun). Diogenes Laertius ix. 69:—οὗτοι πάντες Πυρρώνειοι μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου, ἀπορητικοὶ δὲ καὶ σκεπτικοὶ καὶ ἐπιέφεκτικοὶ καὶ ζητητικοὶ, ἀπὸ τοῦ οἶον δόγματος προσηγορεύοντο. Cf. Antoninus (vi. 20):—πολλὰ παρενθυμώμεθα τῶν οἶον προσηγυνομένων.

ὀπός (gravy). Athenaeus p. 402 c:—περιφέροντο καὶ ἔριφοι πολλάκις ποικίλως ἐσκευασμένοι, ἄλλοι δὲ καὶ πολὺ τοῦ ὀποῦ ἔχοντες.

κλίμαξ (gangway). Arrian (*Anabasis* v. 7, 5, description of the Roman method of bridging rivers):—ἐκατέρωθεν δὲ τοῦ ζεύγματος κλίμακες προβάλλονται καταπηγνύμεναι, τοῦ ἀσφαλεστέραν τοῖς τε ἵπποις καὶ τοῖς ζεύγεσι τὴν ἔξοδον γίνεσθαι καὶ ἅμα ὡς σύνδεσμος εἶναι τοῦ ζεύγματος. The meaning assigned in L. and S. for this word in this passage is manifestly incorrect.

ἐν πύλαις γήρως (growing old). Dio Cassius (57, 24, speaking of Cremutius

Cordus):—ἐν πύλαις ἤδη γήρως ἦν καὶ ἐπιεικέστατα ἐβειβώκει.

δινοβία (a violent flood):—δινοβίας δὲ συμβάσης, Hypothesis to *Demosthenis contra Calliclem* p. 1271. (Not in L. and S.)

In reading Appian I have noticed the following words and expressions which may be worthy of remark:—

*Preface*, ch. 11. ἕως ἑπτακοσίοις ἔτεσι κακοπαθοῦντές τε καὶ κινδυνεύοντες ἀγχωμαλώς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐς τόδε προήγαγον. Thucydides has ἀγχώματα. L. and S. cite an instance from Lucian *V.H.* 37.

*Preface*, ch. 15. ἐπίνειος, ον, adjective. In classical Greek the neuter is used as a noun, but there is no adjective. εἴ τι προσαναλίσκουσιν ἐς τὰς ἐπινείους φρουράς. Nipperdey proposes to read ἐς τὰ ἐπίνεια καὶ φρουράς.

*Punica*, ch. 112. ἀγορανομία used for the Roman *aedileship* (Plutarch and others translate *aedilis* by ἀγορανόμος). ὁ Σκιπίων (οὗ γάρ πω δι' ἡλικίαν αὐτῷ συνεχώρουν ὑπατεύειν οἱ νόμοι) ἀγορανομίαν μετήει.

*Punica*, ch. 129. κολάπτειν (of horses). ἵπποι δ' αὐτοὺς διαθέοντες ἐς τὰς ὤψεις ἢ τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ἐκόλαπτον.

*Punica*, ch. 130. δαπανᾶν (of time). καὶ τὰτα πονουμένων ἔδαπανήθησαν ἐξ ἡμέραι τε καὶ νύκτες.

*Syriaca*, ch. 46. μέλλαν (with reference to the will of others). This rare use of the word is found in *Iliad* xi. 700. πρέσβεις ἔπεμπον οἱ τοὺς ἐλέφαντας συγκόψειν ἔμελλον καὶ τὰς ναῦς διαπρήσειν. Cf. Euripides (*Her. Fur.* 463): Εὐρισθέως δ' ἔμελλες οἰκήσειν δόμους.

*Civil Wars* i. ch. 61. καταρρέω (of young eagles flying down). Aristophanes uses the word of men falling down. παιδὶ γὰρ ὄντι φασὶν ἐς τὸν κόλπον ἀετοῦ νεοττοῦς ἐπτά καταρρῆναι.

*Civil Wars* v. ch. 144. ἐπιγράφειν (to sign a man's name, to forge a name). εἰσὶ δ' οἱ Πλάγκον λέγοντες ἐπιγράφειν τὸν Ἀντώνιον καὶ τῇ σφραγίδι χρῆσθαι.

*Civil Wars* v. ch. 87. αὐτοσχέδιος meaning extemporised, hurriedly prepared. οἱ δὲ ταξίαρχοι τὸν αὐτοκράτορα ἐς αὐτοσχέδιον σκηνὴν ἔσαγαγόντες. Compare Achilles Tatius iii. ch. 7, εἴκε τὸ θέαμα αὐτοσχέδιῳ τάφῳ.

E. J. CHINNOCK.

## BÖHMER'S SICILIAN ODES OF PINDAR.

*Pindars Sicilische Oden nebst den epizephyr-ischen. Mit Prosaübersetzung und Erläuterungen, von EDUARD BÖHMER. Bonn, 1891. 5 Mk.*

THE origin of this work may be traced back, we are told in the Preface, to a Programme which appeared in 1829 at Stettin entitled *Bemerkungen über Pindar* by the author's father, F. Böhrer, and which seems to have attracted considerable attention. Drawn by his father's tract to the study of Pindar, Mr. E. Böhrer attended the lectures of Boeckh in 1849, and has, since that time, constantly occupied himself with the study of the poet, and has formed a Pindaric library which is, I have no doubt, the most complete in Europe. He made a collation of the Medicean MSS. for the *Olympian Odes*, which he placed at the disposal of Bergk, who however wrongly refers to him under his father's name. The present edition of the *Sicilian Odes*—the first work which he has published—thus represents some of the ripe results of a lifetime of familiarity with the poet, and therefore deserves the respectful attention of all students of Pindar.

Mr. Böhrer has aimed above all things at compression. His edition consists of only xx. and 113 pages; one of the chief purposes of the prose translation (printed opposite to the text) is to save the necessity of 'countless notes on construction and meaning.' He has paid special attention to metre on which he has some original views, and gives in his section on *Silbenrhythmus* some useful statistics. His speculations on *Orchestik* are ingenious, difficult and rather daring, but well worth reading.

The Odes are arranged chronologically. In *Pyth.* vi., which comes first, Mr. Böhrer has made two striking contributions to the correction of the text. The opening lines at present appear in our texts thus:

ἀκούσαρ' ἣ γὰρ ἐλικώπιδος Ἀφροδίτας  
ἄρουραν ἣ Χαρίτων  
ἀναπολίζομεν κ.τ.λ.

An alternative has no place here, and Mr. Böhrer by writing ἣ Χαρίτων—a change which is really no change—restores the sense. This correction is in my judgment quite certain. The other emendation is, though not certain, at least worthy of consideration. In ll. 47, 48 the MSS. give

νόφ δὲ πλοῦτον ἄγει  
ἄδικον οὐθ' ἐπέροπλον ἦβαν δρέπων,

violating the metre in l. 48,—the scheme being

— — — | — — — | — — — — | — — — | — — —

Böhrer reads

ἄδικον ἦβαιον οὐθ' ἐπέροπλον δρέπων

'indem er Unrechtes nicht das Geringste noch auch Hoffärtiges pflückt.' For αἶ cp. αἶολε, *Pyth.* iv. 233, Γαιαόχῳ, *Ol.* xiii. 78. With the treatment of other difficulties in this difficult ode I cannot always agree. Hermann's *váion* in l. 4 for *váon* seems extremely doubtful. In 12 sqq.—

οὐτ' ἄνεμος ἐς μυχούς  
ἀλὸς ἄξιοισι, παμφόρῳ χεράδι  
τυπτόμενος.—

four MSS. have *ἄνεμοι* and *τυπτόμενοι*, which Mr. Böhrer adopts. I question the phrase *ἄνεμοι τυπτόμενοι χεράδι* and most editors have found it a stumbling-block. I think we should read (*ἄνεμοι* and) *τυπτομένους*, agreeing with *μυχούς*. The same error occurs in *Nem.* x. 62, where the MSS. have *ἦμενος* instead of *ἡμένους*. This solution at once explains the pairs of variants, *ἄνεμοι*, -ος and *τυπτόμενος*, -οι. For when the accusative participle was read as a nominative, two courses were open, either to assimilate *τυπτόμενος* to *ἄνεμοι* (whence *τυπτόμενοι*) or to assimilate *ἄνεμοι* to *τυπτόμενος* (whence *ἄνεμος*).

There is another well-known difficulty in l. 46.

τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Θρασύβουλος  
πατρῶν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα,  
46 πατρῶ τ' ἐπερχόμενος ἀγλαίαν ἔδειξεν.

So most texts. But there are two difficulties. (1) The MSS. give *ἔδειξεν ἅπασαν*, which makes the line too long by — —. The question is, Are we to reject *ἅπασαν* or *ἔδειξεν*? (2) How is *ἐπερχόμενος* to be explained? Mr. Böhrer, keeping *ἔδειξεν*, explains in the usual way, 'und dem Oheim nachstrebend zeigte er sich glänzend.' But it may be gravely questioned whether *ἐπερχόμενος* can bear such a meaning. And it seems to me (as to Christ) that *ἔδειξεν* is far more likely to be the adscript than

ἄπασαν. ἀγλαίαν ἄπασαν is a characteristic Pindaric phrase. I fancy that most editors feel this, but keep εἰδειν because they regard a verb as absolutely necessary. ἐπερχόμενος ἀγλαίαν ἄπασαν can only mean 'traversing a world of splendour,' and thus πάτρω τ' remains as the problem demanding solution. I suggest that Pindar here used the genitive form in -ω (which is implied by the dative πάτρω), and propose to read :

πατρώαν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα  
πάτρω τ', ἐπερχόμενος ἀγλαίαν ἄπασαν.

'He walked according to the lines marked out by his father and his uncle.'

But if ἄπασαν is original in l. 46, on the other hand πάσαις is surely an 'additamentum' in l. 50. This is one of the most puzzling verses in Pindar. The reading of the MSS.—

τὴν τ' Ἐλέλιχθον ὀργαῖς πάσαις ὅς ἱππεῖαν  
ἰσοδόν  
(μᾶλα δδόντι νόψ Ηοσειδῶν προσέχεται)—

gives neither metre nor meaning. The omission of πάσαις rectifies the metre but does not restore the sense. Christ's ὀργᾶς ὅς ἱππεῖαν ἰσοδόν (after M. Schmidt) is perhaps the simplest correction that has been yet proposed, but is, I am sure, not what Pindar wrote. Mr. Böhmer reads

ὀργαῖς πᾶν ἱππεῖαν ἐς ἰδόν

'sein Trachten ganz in die Rossebahn,'—a rather halting construction. I submit that it is a mistake to build any restoration of the passage on πάσαις. The corruption lies in ὀργαῖς and πάσαις was introduced to eke out the meaning. I cannot satisfy myself about the restoration; I will only suggest that ὀργαῖς may lurk behind ὀργαῖς.

In *Pyth.* xii. 12 Mr. Böhmer gives εἰναλίᾳ τε Σερίφω λᾶσι τε for εἰναλίᾳ Σερίφω λαοῖσι τε, and in *Ol.* xi. 15 τῶν Ζεφυρίων Λοκρῶν for τῶν Ἐπιζεφυρίων Λοκρῶν, both excellent corrections, though I doubt whether the second be really necessary. In *Pyth.* i. 4 he adopts the form προνομιών, which seems very probable, but it is hard to accept Bücheler's ἀντράπλους in *Pyth.* i. 92.

In *Ol.* i. 50

τραπέζαισι τ' ἀμφὶ δεύτατα κρεῶν  
σέθεν διεδάσαντο καὶ φάγον,

Mr. Böhmer translates 'um die Tische das

Letzte von deinem Fleisch vertheilt und gegessen,' and explains in his brief note; 'es sei zum zweiten Mal herumgereicht (δεύτερα) und dann noch der Rest, so dass gar nichts übriggeblieben.' It is hard to believe that Pindar meant to insist on three, if not more, dishings-up of the flesh of Pelops. I cannot acquiesce in this interpretation of δεύτατα. A Paris MS. (V) has ἀμφιδεύματα and a Venetian (W) ἀμφὶ δεύματα. I suspect that δεύματα is the right reading and that we have here an unusual word connected with γείνομαι and the Hesychian glosses ζεύσασθαι, δεύσασθαι.

A little further on in the same ode we read of Tantalus :

κόρψ δ' ἔλεν  
ἄταν ὑπέροπλον ἄν οἱ πατὴρ ὑπερ  
κρέμασε καρτερὸν αὐτῷ λίθον.

The duplicate pronoun, οἱ αὐτῷ, is strange as there is no point in the emphasis. Mr. Böhmer translates the text in the only possible way, taking αὐτῷ in close connexion with καρτερὸν, 'einen ihm beharrlichen Stein;' but one still fails to see the point of the limitation. Now it is to be observed that the MSS. all give τᾶν οἱ, which violates the metre. Hermann restored ἄν. I have no doubt that τ accidentally got into the wrong place and that Pindar wrote

ἄταν ὑπέροπλον, ἄν τ οἱ πατὴρ κ.τ.λ.

'which, as all know.'—In l. 80 Bergk's conjecture ματῆρας for μναστῆρας is adopted. In 89 ἔτεκε for ἄ τέκε gives an asyndeton which is quite in Pindar's manner. In 104 (πέποιθα δὲ ξένον μὴ τιν' ἀμφοτέρα καλῶν τε ἴδριν ἄμα καὶ δύναμιν κυριώτερον κ.τ.λ.), where ἄμα καὶ is unmetrical, Mr. Böhmer makes the striking emendation ἀμάκι καὶ, comparing the form θαμάκι. In 112 he keeps ἀλκᾷ τρέφει 'zur Stärke nährt,' which, I think, is impossible. ἀλκᾷ would have to be either instrumental or dative of interest. I propose ἄλκαρ = 'ut praesidium, munimentum.'

In *Ol.* ii. 6 the MSS. have (Θήρωνα)

γεγωνητέον ὅπλῃ δίκαιον ξένον, ἔρευσμ' Ἀκραγαν-  
τος.

Hartung, Mommsen, and Bergk read ὅπιν δίκαιον ξένον. But such a use of ὅπιν seems extremely doubtful, as Mr. Böhmer also judges, for he adopts Hermann's ὅπι with Hartung's ξένον. But is not ὅπι for ὅπιδι as questionable a form as ἐλπί would be for ἐλπίδι or ἐπι for ἐπιδι? Surely the obvious emendation is

γεγωνητέον ὅτι δίκαιον ξένων,—

a good instance of the omission of one of two identical syllables. In his metrical scheme Mr. Böhmer admits \_ \_ for \_ in this place. In l. 10 (αἰὼν δ' ἔφεπε μόρσιμος πλοῦτόν τε καὶ χάριν ἄγων) I suggest μόρσιμ' ἐπὶ, if ἐπάγω seems called for; cf. below l. 37.—By the simple change of οὗ τι to οὗ τί, the editor has restored vv. 30 *sqq.*, which now read thus:

ἦτοι βροτῶν γε κέκριται  
πείρας οὐ τί θανάτου,  
οὐδ' ἀσύχμον ἀμέραν ὅποτε.....τελευτάσομεν.

But it is hard to accept the doctrine of a causal genitive with the perfect passive, which Mr. Böhmer adopts to explain βροτῶν. He cites *Pyth.* ii. 90 στάθμας δέ τινος ἐλκόμενοι περισσῶς ἐνέπαζαν ἔλκος, but surely the causal στάθμας depends in strict grammar on ἔλκος, not on ἐλκόμενοι. Again in *Nem.* iii. 52 (λεγόμενον τοῦτο προτέρων ἔπος) προτέρων depends on ἔπος; and in *Ol.* viii. 43 (φάσμα Κρονίδα πεμφθέν Διός) Διός depends on φάσμα, not on πεμφθέν—the φάσμα is conceived to belong to Zeus. The same explanation applies to *Ol.* ix. 100; and even if the editor's interpretation of *Nem.* i. 8 be correct, θεῶν must depend on ἀρχαί, not on βέβληται. So too here; βροτῶν is determined not by κέκριται but by πείρας.—In v. 52 Mr. Böhmer reads διφροσινῶν for δυσφροσινῶν which is metrically impossible. I

venture to regard Dindorf's δυσφρονῶν as more probable. In 74 the text is altered by punctuating after ὄρμοισι:—

τὰ μὲν χερσὸθεν ἀπ' ἀγλαῶν δενδρέων,  
ὕδωρ δ' ἄλλα φέρβει  
ὄρμοισι. τῶν χέρας ἀναπλέκοντι καὶ στεφάνους

ὄρμοισι is thus taken to mean 'in the havens' of the happy island, whereas, according to the old punctuation, it was explained 'with wreaths.' The following words are explained: 'Von ihnen winden sie Händevolle auch zu Kränzen.' Can χέρας mean 'handfuls'? I should prefer to read στεφάνους with a few MSS. In 97 κρυφόν τε θέμιν ἐσλὸν κακοῖς is read and κρυφόν (*sic*; vulg. κρύφον) explained as an adjective (cf. κυφός), I have no doubt rightly.—In *Nem.* i. 72 Mr. Böhmer reads νόμον with Mommsen. In *Isth.* ii. 10 he accepts Bergk's ἐτάς.

Within the limits of this notice I have only been able to deal, and that imperfectly, with one side of this suggestive edition, namely the treatment of the text. I need hardly say that new light is thrown on the interpretation of many passages, where the actual text needs no discussion; and I only hope that Mr. Böhmer will soon permit himself to give us his views on some of those odes of his poet which were composed for other than Western victors.

J. B. BURY.

#### ISOKRATES UND DIE GESCHICHTSCHREIBUNG.

Vortrag gehalten zu München am 23 Mai 1891 in der vierten allgemeinen Sitzung der 41. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner, von RUDOLF V. SCALA. Leipzig: Teubner. 1892. 12 Mk.

THE most ardent admirer of Isocrates would scarcely venture to maintain that he can be regarded as a trustworthy authority on matters of history, and the author of *Die Studien des Polybios* is as sensible of his shortcomings in this respect as even Busolt himself. Nor does he credit him with philosophical insight, though he has shown both here (p. 6 *sqq.*) and elsewhere (*Zur philosophischen Bildung des Isokrates, Jahrb. f. Klass. Philol.* 1891, 445—448) that he was not unacquainted with the earlier philosophical systems. But he maintains

that the ability and influence of Isocrates as a politician have been underrated and that as a 'preacher of unity' he is worthy to be classed with such men as Fichte, Machiavelli and Manin. Dr. von Scala adduces (p. 15) as a striking instance of political insight what he elsewhere (*Stud. des Pol.* i. 303) calls the 'marvellously statesmanlike advice' given by Isocrates to Philip (*Philipp.* § 154). It is interesting to notice that this more generous estimate of Isocrates, so different from that of Niebuhr, has the support of such authorities as B. Keil (*Analecta Isocratea*, p. 11) and Holm (*Griech. Gesch.* iii. 448).

But the most important part of this Isocratean 'study' is that which treats of the influence of Isocrates on later writers of history. Greek prose literature has sus-



tained no greater loss than that of the works of Theopompus and Ephorus. Their indebtedness to their teacher in regard to style is clearly indicated by Dr. Blass in his valuable account of them (*Att. Bered.* ii. 369 *sqq.*), but he distinctly denies the direct influence of Isocrates on their mode of treating history. Dr. von Scala, on the other hand, strives to show that there is evidence of an intellectual bond of union between teacher and pupils. Of course opinions may differ as to the existence of this connexion in particular cases, but the

instances of similarity cited by Dr. von Scala are certainly rather striking. Lastly the writer finds both in the language and in the political views of Polybius some traces of Isocratean influence.

One or two of the references need correction: p. 9, note 6, for  $\pi$ .  $\epsilon\iota\pi$ . 16 read 'Αρεσπ. 16, and for 'Αντιδ. 26 read  $\pi$ .  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\zeta\epsilon\nu\gamma$ . 26, 27, 'Αντιδ. 306; on the same page, note 11, after Παργγ. insert 49; p. 11, note 2, for 9760 read 8700.

HENRY CLARKE.

#### ARISTOTLE'S CONSTITUTION OF ATHENS.

*Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*: a revised text &c. by J. E. SANDYS. Macmillan. 1893. 15s.

*Aristotelis Πολιτεία* 'Αθηναίων. Edidit FRIDERICUS BLASS. Teubner. 1892. Mk. 1.50.

*Fleckeisen's Jahrbuch*, October, 1892. *Mitteilungen aus papyrus-handschriften*. F. BLASS.

*Aristoteles, Der Staat der Athener*. Der historische Hauptteil für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Dr. KARL HUDE. Teubner. 1892. 60 pfg.

*Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens*: translated and annotated by E. POSTE. Second edition. Macmillan. 1892. 3s. 6d.

IN the second edition of his translation Mr. Poste has added a good many short notes on the contents of the treatise as well as statements of the readings which he is translating. Both these additions will make the book more serviceable. The translation has been modified in a few places, and in others some of the explanatory additions, previously inserted in the text, are now relegated to the notes. There still remain however many additions of this kind, which have no business to appear in the text of the translation. Such are (p. 78) 'deme or township' (rather awkwardly called 'municipality' a few lines further on); p. 79 'epheboi or cadets'; p. 82 'Tholos or Rotunda.' Any reader would think that the Greek author was responsible for these explanatory words, as Mr. Poste does not indicate that they are his own. There is now appended to the book a useful sketch, occupying some thirty pages, of 'legal procedure' at Athens.

NO. LX. VOL. VII.

Dr. Sandys' book is much the most complete edition of the 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία which has yet appeared, and it will be found a valuable piece of work. It is not so much that the editor has further improved the text or that he has thrown much new light on the historical difficulties arising from it. The merit of the book consists rather in the thorough collection of all the information bearing upon the contents of the treatise and their copious illustration from historians, orators, inscriptions, and miscellaneous sources. This is perhaps more especially valuable in the second half of the book, which describes the constitutional arrangements of Athens in the author's own time. As far as I can judge this part of Dr. Sandys' work, in which he states that he has had assistance from Mr. Newman and from Professors Mayor and Wyse, there would seem little left for other editors to add.

The commentary is preceded by eighty pages of introductory matter, divided into sections, the most important of which are (3) 'the evidence of ancient authorities on the authorship of the *πολιτεία*,' and (7) 'date and authorship of the treatise,' while (10) 'conspectus of the literature of the subject' will be useful to specialists. In the first of these he collects the passages in which the *πολιτεία*, or any of them, are ascribed to Aristotle by ancient writers: in the second he considers the doubts which have been expressed as to the authorship and concludes in favour of Aristotle. On the first point, the ascription to Aristotle by ancient writers, he seems to concur more or less in the arguments by which Prof. J. H. Wright in the *American Journal of Philology* has sought to show

that Philochorus quoted the 'A. II. as Aristotle's. As this would be the earliest authority, we cannot be too careful in scrutinizing it. The evidence seems to me by no means sufficient. It is contended that the scholium on Ar. *Vesp.* 1223 may be shown to come ultimately from Philochorus and that it contains some words from the 'A. II. The evidence does not at all prove it to come from Philochorus; but, even supposing that it does and that he borrowed from the 'A. II., the scholium does not mention any treatise, much less ascribe it to Aristotle. So again, supposing that in fragment 57 Philochorus had a phrase of the 'A. II. in mind, how does that tend to show that he regarded the 'A. II. as Aristotle's? The truth is that these two arguments, if we admit their soundness, only go to show that he knew the work, not that he knew it as Aristotle's, and no one that I know of since the discovery of the treatise has disputed the fact that at any rate the greater part of it was earlier than Philochorus and might have been known to him. A third argument of Prof. Wright's, which unlike the others does tend to the required conclusion, is admittedly too much founded on what 'may have' been to carry any serious weight. It might be added to other evidence, if evidence there were: in itself it is purely conjectural. We are therefore still far from proof that 'a careful historical student and critic, who lived and wrote at Athens in the generation immediately following Aristotle's' believed the 'A. II. to be the genuine work of the philosopher. But, even if he did, this would not be quite conclusive against a theory which ascribed it to the Aristotelian school. *Descriptive Sociology* is easily confused with Mr. Spencer's own writings. Dumont's work has been mistaken for Bentham's before now.

I am not concerned to defend the thesis that Demetrius Phalereus or Dicaearchus was the author, but there is a palpable fallacy in part of the editor's reasoning against it. 'Of all the passages attributed to the work of Demetrius *περὶ τῆς Ἀθηνῶν νομοθεσίας*...not one is to be found in the *πολιτεία*': and again 'It is equally impossible to assign it to Aristotle's pupil, Dicaearchus, for not a single fragment attributed to him by ancient authorities is to be found in the 'A. II.' But if, as we are all agreed, the work was from early times ascribed to Aristotle, what likelihood was there of passages from it being quoted by late writers as belonging to some one else?

Dr. Sandys' argument shows, not that Demetrius or Dicaearchus did not write it, but that they were not thought to have written it, and this we knew before.

Though he thinks Aristotle wrote the *πολιτεία*, Dr. Sandys holds that the *συνηγμένα πολιτεία* of *Eth.* x. 9, 23 refers not to them, but to what Aristotle was going to write, and afterwards did write, in some parts of the *Politics*. To me it seems that the words are unsuitable to what we find in the *Politics*, and that they clearly refer to some collection or collections already in existence, not implying at all that Aristotle was the collector, but, if anything, the opposite. This is Rose's view, as Dr. Sandys mentions. He points out a resemblance between 'A. II. c. 16 and certain parts of the *Politics*, in respect of both language and ideas, which is undoubtedly noticeable. But, if the work belonged to the Aristotelian school, might we not expect this sometimes to be the case, as it is in a few other passages? He believes himself that the greater part of the *Politics* was written some years at least before the 'A. II.

At the time of the publication of the 'A. II. attention was called in this *Review* to various points of language in which it seemed noticeably different from the Greek of Aristotle. A few of these have been removed by emendations now generally adopted, but there remain a fair number of things which a student of Aristotle's language will observe with some doubt. Dr. Sandys, who notices most of them, has not done much to weaken the argument (whatever its strength may be) which is founded on them. For one or two (e.g. the use of *σροάζεσθαι* in the second sentence of c. 22) he has found an Aristotelian parallel. As to the doubtful use of the 'retrospective' *χάριν* with a genitive in c. 29 and of *ἐνός* with numbers in c. 49, he urges that they are really quoted from public documents. I had not overlooked the fact that this might be pleaded in their behalf; but it does not appear at all certain how far the writer is giving the actual words of the law or other document referred to. If *χάριν* was the word used in the document, it is a somewhat curious thing; for Meisterhans § 83, 53 states that, as a preposition, it never occurs in prose inscriptions until 50 B.C. Whether *ἐνός* is used with numbers in inscriptions I do not know: Meisterhans makes no mention of it. The final conjunction *ὅνα* occurs twice at least in abstracts of documents in the 'A. II. (29 and 31), but according to Meisterhans it occurs twice only in all Attic inscriptions

before the third century. In illustration of  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$  = simple  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  with participles (c. 7  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron \tau\omicron\upsilon \pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\iota\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu$ ) Dr. Sandys quotes three passages. But I pointed out, in first calling attention to this use, that two of the three (which are given in the *Index A*) come from a work, the *περὶ ἀκουστών*, now generally considered of later date; while in the third (*An. Post.* i. 3, 72 b 9)  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$  does not really =  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ , but  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  has its proper meaning and  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \omicron\kappa \acute{\alpha}\nu \epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$  represents something like  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\eta \omicron\kappa \acute{\alpha}\nu \epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha$ , not  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota\delta\eta \omicron\kappa \epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha$ . This use of  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$  is just one of the small things that may mean a good deal. I cannot help doubting the  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$  in line 12 of the long iambic quotation from Solon.

In the commentary more attention might perhaps have been given to some curious words, such as *παραπτραγηθήναι*, *καταφατίζω*, and others, and to a few rather noticeable uses of words otherwise known. Is there any parallel for *τελείν πεντακοσίου μέδιμον* in c. 7? C. 15 has *ἐκκλησιάζειν ἐπεχείρει*, 'he began to harangue the people.' Is there any certain parallel for *ἐκκλησιάζειν* in this sense? Thuc. viii. 77 seems doubtful. The use of *καθήκων* at the end of c. 16 seems peculiar enough to need illustration or notice. The phrase *ἀναγράφειν τὴν πολιτείαν*, which occurs four times in chapters 30–32, is strange. If it occurred only once or twice, we might think it a blunder for *συγγράφειν*, which occurs at the beginning of c. 30, but *συγγράφειν* can hardly have been corrupted four times. Yet *ἀναγράφειν* does not seem to occur elsewhere in this sense of 'framing.' Perhaps some of these points may be illustrated from inscriptions.

It has been noticed that the author of the 'A. II. occasionally goes so far in following his authorities as to use un-Attic words, e.g. the *προφέρειν* of Herodotus in c. 19. (*Χρησθησόμενοι* in the same sentence is Herodotean, not Attic.) Dr. Sandys remarks 'this is no proof of spuriousness, as Aristotle frequently refers to Herodotus in his undisputed works.' There is however a great difference between referring to Herodotus by name as an authority for something and transferring his un-Attic vocabulary to an Attic book without any indication of what is being done. No doubt Aristotle is not a writer of pure Attic, but one would be glad to think he did not compile in this rather servile and inartistic way. Dr. Sandys has by an oversight included some references to Hesiod in his list of Aristotelian references to Herodotus, and in the first reference 123 is a misprint for 1236.

(I cannot find in the *C.I.A.* the passage referred to by Dr. Sandys on p. 61 as containing the form *πρόπυλον*.)

Is not the note on c. 12, line 51 somewhat misleading, when it implies that *φράζεσθαι* can, like *φράζειν*, mean 'tell'? The middle voice has surely no such meaning. In c. 30 can *τῶν ἄλλων ὁσίων χρημάτων*, as opposed to *τῶν ἱερῶν*, really be defended as good Greek? The article would have to be repeated before *ὁσίων*. Perhaps *ὁσίων* is a gloss on *ἄλλων*. I observe however that Blass prints *τῶν ἄλλων ὁσίων*, just as he agrees with the English editors in retaining the indefensible present tense in c. 42 *χειροτονεῖ... διδασκάλους, οἵτινες ὀπλομαχεῖν... διδάσκουσιν*, where Greek idiom imperatively requires *διδάξουσιν*. In c. 39 the subject of *συμπείθειν* is most certainly not 'the people,' but the emigrants to Eleusis, who are the subject of the infinitives preceding and following; this the sense requires. Earlier in the same chapter, in a note on the words *τοὺς βουλομένους Ἀθηναίων τῶν ἐν ἄστει μεινάντων ἐξοικεῖν ἔχειν Ἑλευσίνα*, Dr. Sandys joins the last three words together, but in reality *ἐξοικεῖν* goes with *βουλομένους*. At the end of c. 43 he seems, if I understand him rightly, to make *ἄνευ προχειροτονίας* = *ἄνευ προβουλευματος*: does it not rather mean that they discuss the *προβούλευμα* without first voting on the question whether it shall be discussed? But it is a piece of clumsiness in the text, if complete, that *προχειροτονία* has not been previously mentioned and explained. Perhaps something is lost. In c. 15 he seems to understand *ἐξοπλισίαν ἐν τῷ Θησείῳ ποιησάμενος* of the actual building: surely it is only the precinct that is meant.

In preparing his text Dr. Sandys was unfortunately not able to avail himself of the results of Blass's examination of the papyrus. When Blass published his text, he had studied the facsimile only: but in the course of last year he was able to work at the papyrus itself (which it is interesting and important to know that he found considerably easier to read than the facsimile) and he extracted from it a fair number of new readings, as a rule not of great importance, which are published in the article cited at the beginning of this review. Assuming what is probably the case, though we should like to know Mr. Kenyon's opinion on the point, that most of these are tolerably certain, it follows that Dr. Sandys' text as well as Blass's own requires alteration in not a few places. He has however been able to give the new readings at the end of his introduction, though it

was too late to introduce any of them into the text. Among the most noticeable are ἐνθύμιον ἦν for Mr. Kenyon's original [παρωμιάζε]το in c. 16, where Blass had himself previously read ἐθρυλλεῖτο (ἐνθύμιον ἦν does not seem to give the right sense): ταῖς ἀν...αῖς for ταῖς ἀγοραῖς in c. 48, which Blass thinks may possibly represent ἀναδικαῖαι, though this again seems unsatisfactory: and ἐν ἱερῷ καὶ ὑπαίθριοι in c. 57, which is supported by a mention of the ἱερόν further on and seems likely to be right. Dr. Sandys had meanwhile conjectured ἐν ἡλιαίᾳ in this last passage. In Hude's text, which does not extend to the descriptive part of the 'A. II., but contains the historical part only, most, if not all, of Blass's readings in chapters 4 to 41 are embodied.

I will now briefly remark on a few passages where the right reading seems still doubtful. In c. 3 Kenyon and Blass agree now that the MS. has οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες ὁμνόνουσι καθάπερ ἐπὶ Ἀκάστον τὰ ὅρκια ποιήσιν, and so Dr. Sandys reads. Not one of them however explains in what sense the last words are to be taken. 'Swear that they will swear' or 'swear to make a treaty' is surely a very strange sense, to say nothing of the fact that the middle ποιέσθαι would seem required. One would expect something like τὰ δίκαια (τὰ νόμιμα) ποιήσιν, like the δίκαιος ἄρξιν of c. 55. Nor can I find any satisfactory explanation of ἀντὶ τῶν δοθεισῶν (ἀνταποδοθεισῶν Sandys) τῷ ἄρχοντι δωρεῶν in the next line. Surely δωρεῶν cannot mean 'privileges,' i.e. powers. In c. 5 Blass now reads in the papyrus

γινώσκω, καὶ μοι φρενὸς ἔνδοθεν ἄλγεα κέϊται,  
πρεσβυτάτην ἑσορῶν γαῖαν Ἰαονίας  
καινομένην,

thus substituting καινομένην for the disputed καὶ γὰρ ἐπελαίνει of the *editio princeps*. It is hard to believe that Solon could use so violent an expression as γαῖαν καινομένην instead of one of the words he uses elsewhere, δαλυμένην, φθειρομένην, τρυχομένην. I suggest therefore that the original word was μαινομένην. In the first hand of the papyrus κ and μ seem to be by no means unlike. Hude reads ἑσορῶντ' αἶαν from his own conjecture. The same change had occurred to me, but I think it is to be rejected, first as unnecessary, secondly from doubt whether Solon would have either made use of the form αἶα or elided the ι of the dative. Is the dative ι ever elided in elegiac verse? Γινώσκω has been questioned, but in such a mere fragment we can perhaps hardly say that it is

not the right word. As to Ἰαονίας, I still think we ought to read the accusative. I do not feel sure whether Dr. Sandys quite apprehends my objection to the genitive. I find Ἰωρία used as a name for Attica separately (so at least Strabo says), for Achaia separately, and for part of Asia Minor separately. It does not seem to be used anywhere as a collective name for all places inhabited by Ionians; and, even if it was in later times, is it likely to have been so used as early as Solon? Read therefore πρεσβυτάτην...γαῖαν Ἰαονίαν, like πειράς χθονὸς πατρίδος quoted later from Solon. In wishing for the Ionic η (Ἰαονίην) I was wrong: see Meisterhans § 9, 13. In the trochaics of Solon quoted in c. 12 I should read in the words νῦν δέ μοι χολούμενοι λοξὸν ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁρῶσι πάντες ὥστε δῆϊον not δῆϊον but δῆϊω. The MSS. of Plutarch as well as our papyrus appear to give the accusative, but I can find no construction for it. Reiske and Bergk read δῆϊοι, but the dative seems better. In the first line of the trochaics I should not be surprised if οἱ δ' ἐφ' ἀρπαγαῖων ἦλθον stood for οἱ δ' ἐφ' ἀρπαγῇ συνήλθον (cf. ἐφ' ἀρπαγῇ in Solon *Fr.* 4, 13), more especially if ξυνήγαγον is the right reading in the first line of the long iambic quotation following. In the latter much disputed passage Dr. Sandys accepts as quite satisfactory (*unice veram*) the reading and explanation of Jebb and Blass:

ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν μὲν οὐνεκα ξυνήγαγον  
δῆμον, τί τούτων πρὶν τυχεῖν ἐπανασάμην;  
συμμαρτυροῖη ταῦτ' ἂν ἐν δίκῃ χρόνον  
μήτηρ μεγίστη δαιμόνων Ὀλυμπίων  
ἄριστα, γῇ μέλαινα.

'But, as to the ends for which I formed the popular party....why did I desist before I had attained those ends?' Surely Solon does not admit that he failed to attain his ends. Dr. Sandys strangely thinks this explanation confirmed by the subsequent words ταῦτα μὲν...ἔρεξα καὶ διήλθον ὡς ἕσπερχόμεν, which seem to me on the contrary enough to upset it. If ξυνήγαγον is right, as seems probable, I should rather expect something like ἐγὼ δέ, τῶν μὲν οὐνεκα ξυνήγαγον (i.e. δῆμον), <ὡς οὐ> τι τούτων πρὶν τυχεῖν ἐπανασάμην, συμμαρτυροῖη κ.τ.λ. The μὲν is then repeated in ταῦτα μὲν (line 15) and answered by δέ in κέντρον δ' ἄλλος κ.τ.λ. (line 20). But it may be too bold to conjecture that a gloss, δῆμον, has ousted ὡς οἱ. At the beginning of 26 I would suggest now that, if an epithet to ἡγεμόνα has been lost,



as I hold to be tolerably certain, it is likely to have been πολιτικόν. This would have the incidental advantage of doing away with the hiatus between ἡγεμόνα and ἔχειν. Compare the use of πολιτικός in cc. 18 and 28. In 51 πολῆται should be altered to πολήσεται, as χρήσονται has been to χρῆσονται. Perhaps I may mention here that on pages 8, 65, and 113 the editor attributes to me emendations which were not mine.

In concluding this notice of Dr. Sandys' book, in which I have dwelt most upon points on which opinions differ, I may say that I have myself derived much information and assistance from it and that no one studying the 'A. II. carefully can afford to neglect it. The materials collected by the editor will be found very serviceable and his judgment in dealing with them is always entitled to respect. The notes consist of three divisions: (1) critical notes on the text, giving in many cases even the proposed emendations which the editor does not accept; (2) *testimonia*, or references to all the passages of lexicographers, scholia, &c., in which quotations or paraphrases of our text are to be found, these passages being as a rule given in full; (3) a very full commentary of a miscellaneous kind. With the help of the *indices* in the Dutch edition Dr. Sandys has given a complete and useful Greek index, in which 'passages quoted from the poems of Solon and the decrees of Athens' are distinguished from 'citations from the body of the work,' and all words hitherto unknown or not occurring in the *Index Aristotelicus* have distinguishing marks attached to them.

The Teubner text, edited by Blass before he had studied the papyrus itself, is preceded by an introduction dated January 1892, from which a few points of interest may be noted. He pronounces decidedly in favour of the genuineness of the treatise, but does not discuss the question. He concurs with Mr. Kenyon as to the four hands of the MS., and this is repeated in the *Mittheilungen* above cited. He holds the MS. to have been written at any rate before the third century, but does not seem confident of its being much earlier. Applying his rhythmical theories to the text, he finds that the earlier part of the treatise is very carefully finished in this respect, and apparently that there is nothing to make him doubt the Aristotelian authorship. Many scholars however will think that this rhythmical theory is pressed too far. See some remarks of Professor Butcher on the subject in *Class. Rev.* V. 311. There are short critical notes to the book, references to the *testimonia*, and an index to the more noticeable words, phrases, and things.

Hude's school edition of the historical part of the treatise has short German notes—the book also appears in Danish—well adapted for their purpose. Using as it does the new readings derived by Blass from personal study of the papyrus, it is probably at present the best text of the historical chapters, though no doubt a second edition of the Teubner text will appear before long. There are also a certain number of new readings of Hude's own.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

#### TIMAIOS' GEOGRAPHIE DES WESTENS.

*Philologische Untersuchungen* herausgegeben von A. KIESSLING und W. v. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF. Dreizehntes Heft: Timaios' *Geographie des Westens*, von JOHANNES GEFFCKEN. Berlin, Weidmann: 1892. M. 7.

A NEW and valuable addition to our rather meagre information upon an author in the large list of little known Greek writers who flourished in the generation after the death of Alexander appears in Geffcken's Timaios' *Geographie des Westens*. The author of this work has carefully collected and examined the various passages in different authors which seem to have

Timaeus as their source, and as a result has got together nearly seventy pages of Greek text from which one can get a good idea of Timaeus' work. Geffcken begins his book with a discussion of the authorities from which he has drawn his material. He takes up Lycophron first, then Diodorus Siculus books iv. and v., Trogon Pompeius, Varro, the Paradoxographers and other minor sources in due order. Where he finds a story relating to the western Mediterranean both in Lycophron and in Diodorus he concludes that Timaeus was the source from which it was taken, since both of these writers are known to have made use of his work. Curiously enough Geffcken thinks

he finds traces of Timaeus in lines 1226—1280 of Lycophron's *Alexandra*, although this passage has long been regarded as spurious. Following the discussion of the sources comes the Greek text interspersed here and there with bits of Latin and arranged under the following headings: Sicilia, Aeolides, Illyria cum Liburnia,

Italia, Liguria, Gallia, Hispania, Britannia, Libya and Corsica et Sardinia. The book ends with a summary of the results obtained, followed by three indices and two maps.

WILLIAM N. BATES.

Harvard University.

#### LIAS'S SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

*The Second Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, with Notes and Introduction.

By J. J. LIAS. (Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges.) Cambridge University Press. 1892. Pp. xxix. 156. 3s.

THIS neat little edition has the merits and defects of the same editor's work on the companion epistle (*Class. Review*, 1887, p. 235). A short, clear introduction (pp. xiii.—xvii.) on the origin, character and genuineness of the Epistle is followed by two notes: firstly a *resumé* of Paley's use of the Epistle in the *Horae Paulinae*, secondly on the 'Thorn in the Flesh.' Mr. Lias, who wrote, as he ingenuously confesses, without consulting Lightfoot's note (*Galatians*, pp. 183 *sqq.*), adds one more to the multiplicity of conjectures on the subject, viz. that St. Paul suffered from irritability, which betrayed him into frequent asperity of manner. An analysis paves the way for the text, constructed on the well-known plan of this series. Then comes the commentary. Here the excellence of the matter seems to vary directly with the square of its distance from the text. Of general illustrative matter Mr. Lias has made a very valuable and discriminating collection from many sources; e.g. the note on ἐρωπύθη (iii. 14) draws upon the science of the oculist for a very happy illustration. The vexed question of St. Paul's 'zwischenreise' to Corinth is sensibly discussed and, as the present reviewer holds, with the right result, although the editor does not appear to have wrestled with Schmiedel's elaborate analysis of St Paul's alternative plans of travel. But when we come to the strictly scientific problems of the determination of the true text and of its historical exegesis, there is a falling off. Lest it be said that such nice problems are above the heads of 'schools and colleges,' there is the

brilliantly simple little book of Mr. T. E. Page on the Acts, a perennial witness to the contrary. The present volume makes us sigh for a like treatment of Corinthians. As to exegesis, I will only point out v. 3, where Mr. Lias, who uses Waite, has yet missed one of the happiest things in that scholar's commentary. On the text, much might be said, but the most obvious weakness of the treatment is the habit of throwing into the lighter scale, under the name of 'the great weight of patristic authority' or the like, a great unsifted mass of unspecified 'early fathers' with the general result of giving an appearance of traditional authority to the *Textus Receptus*. Among many examples of this method, I may specify ii. 3 (for καὶ δίας); ii. 16 (against ἐκ . . ἑκ); vi. 16 (for ἡμεῖς against ἡμεῖς). The last example exemplifies the necessity for weighing, not merely counting, alleged patristic testimonies. Quite apart from the known tendency of late patristic MSS. to assimilate citations from the N.T. to the *Text. Rec.*, many of the current 'testimonies' require verification. Tischendorf in the present instance gives among the witnesses for ἡμεῖς 'Athan. 704.' The reference is to a probably spurious treatise, *de Inc. et c. Arian*. Athanasius himself (*Orat. i. 16*) quotes ἡμεῖς . . ἑσμεν, but the editors have failed to note the reference. Hence the false report. *A propos* of Athanasius, Mr. Lias quotes the *contra Sabellii gregales* as genuine. Has he consulted Montfaucon?

If the function of a Greek Testament for schools and colleges is to initiate their members into the elements of a genuinely historical study of the text, the present commentary cannot be unreservedly commended. But the general reader who is sufficiently educated to follow notes on a Greek text will find much in it of interest and value.

A. ROBERTSON.

SCHWARTZ'S *ATHENAGORAS*.

*Athenagorae libellus pro Christianis, Oratio de resurrectione cadaverum.* Recensuit EDUARDUS SCHWARTZ (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, Band iv. Heft 2). Leipzig. 1891. pp. xxxii. 143. M. 3. 60.

THE series of *Texte und Untersuchungen* continues, on a masterly and comprehensive plan, its work of supplying preliminary materials for a future history of early Christian literature. One stone of the great fabric, the fourth volume, is to consist of a critical text of the four Greek Apologists—Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus and Justin. The price is such as to render the texts available as class-books for the lecture room. But the two first numbers which have so far appeared, under the editorship of Mr. E. Schwartz, classical professor at Rostock, not only supply convenient editions, but add most materially to our knowledge of the texts. The same may be confidently expected of the same scholar's edition of Theophilus *ad Autolyceum*, and of the *Apologies* and *Dialogue* of Justin which are being edited by von Gebhardt and Harnack.

In the instalment now under review we have for the first time a satisfactory text of Athenagoras. Some twelve years ago, von Gebhardt, who was collecting material for the present undertaking, ascertained that Schwartz also was at work upon the MSS. of the Greek Apologists. The two scholars joined forces, and agreed upon a subdivision of labour. Accordingly, for the work which fell to his share, Schwartz has had the benefit of von Gebhardt's independent work on the materials—especially as concerns the most important MS., which the two have separately collated. Moreover, Schwartz cordially acknowledges the aid he has received from the counsels of von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, who contributes many excellent conjectures, and deserves, according to Schwartz, the title of joint-editor of Tatian and of Athenagoras alike. From scholars of this calibre exceptionally good work is to be expected: and in this case the expectation is amply justified.

The name and writings of Athenagoras have reached us, as is well known, by the slenderest thread of tradition. With the exception of Methodius (Bonwetsch p. 130, also Epiphanius *Haer.* 64, 20, Phot. *Cod.* 234) no extant Father knows anything of him.

The 'silence of Eusebius,' here as elsewhere, challenges explanation. Rufinus, Jerome, even the omnivorous Photius, ignore him wholly. Only the questionable Philip of Side, as cited by an unknown writer, has something—and that in part unlikely—to tell of Athenagoras.

The MS. tradition, as is now conclusively proved, hangs from a single thread, namely the famous codex (Paris 451) written by one Baanes in the year 914 for Arethas, the learned Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. This conclusion had been approximately anticipated by Harnack, whose preliminary survey of the problem (*Texte u. U.* vol. i. 1882) suggested results which—apart from errors due to the faulty materials then alone available in Otto's *Corpus*—have since been signally confirmed by the labours of von Gebhardt and Schwartz.

That the Paris codex 174 is derived from that of Arethas (A); that A originally contained Tatian's *Oratio ad Graecos*; that the scholia (by the second hand) in A are by Arethas himself—these and some other conjectures of Harnack's were verified by von Gebhardt in 1883. That the works of Athenagoras are anonymous in A, their true author's name having been supplied by a hand of the eleventh century, is an error which Harnack owed to von Otto's collators. The scribe of A, Baanes himself, gave both tracts to Athenagoras. This fact removes one indirect support from Harnack's theory of the early ascription of the *Apology* of Athenagoras to Justin; but there remains much to be said in its support.

Harnack had not ventured to assert the dependence on A of two MSS., viz. Paris 450, which contains Athen. *de Resurrectione* but without the author's name, and the Strassburg MS. famous as the one Greek source for the letter to Diognetus, which, after suffering many things of *opici mures*, was finally annihilated by von Werder's shells in 1870.

Schwartz offers conclusive proofs that these also, with all other extant copies, are of the lineage of A, the *prima manus* of which therefore is our sole MS. evidence for the text of Athenagoras. The corrections of Arethas himself, as well as some readings of the Modena (iii. D. 7) and Paris (450) MSS., rank as conjectures only, sometimes good as conjectures, at any rate

as compared with those of more recent editors, of whom—Maranus more especially—Schwartz speaks with marked severity.

The secondary MSS. then fall into four groups, headed respectively by the Modena and Paris (174 and 450) MSS. and by a lost copy of A, from a copy of which, similar or identical with Monac. 81, Gesner printed what is reputed to be the *editio princeps*. The burnt Strassburg codex was derived from that now at Modena.

Of the reason for this profound neglect by Christian antiquity of one of the very ablest of pre-Nicene writers, Mr. Schwartz can only offer a very tentative account. He was too much of a Platonist for any but the Alexandrines; too realistic in his treatment of the resurrection for the latter. He yielded little material to the historian, none to the martyrologist. These reasons, like Harnack's ingenious theory of the *Apology*, leave something to be explained. But whatever the cause of the neglect, we owe a debt of gratitude to the learned Byzantine bishop, but for whom in all probability Athenagoras would have been to us at most *nominis umbra*.

The edition comprises a preface, dealing with the materials for the text, and giving the readings of the secondary MSS.; the text of the two tracts, with the readings of A when rejected, also the corrections of Arethas, and critical notes; and lastly indices. With regard to the text, that of the *de Resurr.* is in a far more satisfactory state than that of the *Supplicatio*: for some reason it would seem to have been less frequently copied. As to the indices, the care and thoroughness with which they are

done may be partly estimated from the fact that they occupy 64 pages to 79 of text. Of the 64, 51 are taken up with the 'Index graecus' which cites every occurrence of the most important words (although the strictly theological vocabulary is incomplete: e.g. πνεῦμα) and adds copious illustrative quotations. This part of the work, so far as I have been able to test it, is beyond praise. The *Index Nominum et Rerum* (pp. 81–91) comprises most of the material interesting to the classical scholar; e.g. the misquotation of Pindar common to Clement Alex. and Athenagoras, probably from some one second-hand source. To the New Testament quotations I would add a reminiscence of Acts xxv. 11 (p. 3, lines 1, 2); a more obvious use of 1 Tim. ii. 8 (p. 14, l. 23); of 1 Tim. vi. 16 and Gal. iv. 9 (p. 17, ll. 7, 16); at p. 32, l. 25 the reference is to Gen. vi. 4; at p. 43, ll. 11, 12, to 1 Tim. v. 1, 2; at p. 44, l. 17 probably to Rom. i. 27. Of the very few misprints uncorrected at p. xxx., ἀπέθνησκον (p. 39, l. 21) is the only one I have observed which does not come under the head of accidents 'per typothetae culpam post plagulas correctas'—a misfortune in which Mr. Schwartz is not without companions.

In spite, therefore, of the somewhat tart criticism to which Preuschen (*uir fortis peioraque passus*) has subjected it in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1892, No. 22), this edition of *Athenagoras* may be called, with trifling deductions, an exemplary piece of work, and a worthy sequel to the same editor's *Tatian*.

A. ROBERTSON.

#### DR. WORDSWORTH'S EDITION OF THE LATIN VULGATE.

*Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi.* Ad codicum manuscriptorum fidem recensuit IOHANNES WORDSWORTH, S.T.P., Episcopus Sarisburiensis, in operis societatem adsumpto HENRICO IULIANO WHITE, A.M., Societatis S. Andreae Collegii Theologici Sarisburiensis Vice-Principali. Euangelium secundum Lucam. Oxonii, e Typographeo Clarendoniano. MDCCCXIII. 12s. 6d.

THIS new part of the Bishop of Salisbury's great edition of the Latin Vulgate well maintains the character established by its predecessors and it is with great satisfaction

that we see the steady progress made with the publication of a work of such vast labour. We shall only note the readings in a few passages.

In vi. 35 we have two readings, both representing μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες, viz. 'nihil desperantes' and 'nihil inde sperantes.' The latter agrees with the A.V., the former with the Revised Version. The Greek word is of frequent occurrence in Polybius and Diodorus and later writers, always in the sense 'despair.' Nor does there seem any reason for giving it a different signification ('to drive to despair') in Eccclus. xxvii. 21, where we are warned not to reveal the secret of a friend, since thus we should lose



our friend, for a wound may be bound up and for reviling there may be reconciliation but he that has revealed secrets ἀπὸ ληίσιν (i.e. has lost hope of recovering his friend). The present editor judges that of the two readings 'inde sperantes' is the more likely to be Jerome's emendation, and although this is against the usage of the verb elsewhere, it is etymologically admissible as we have e.g. ἀπολαβεῖν = λαβεῖν ἀπό and the necessity of the context here is all but decisive. It is however curious that in this case it is conceivable that 'nihil desperantes' might have originated by a clerical error from 'nihil inde sperantes.' Compare xi. 20 where 'praevenit,' 'pervenit' for ἐφθασε may be either a difference of translation or an instance of error of transcription.

In xv. 8 we have a notable instance of the undoubtedly true reading being lost from all the MSS. The Greek has σαροῖ, and almost all the Latin copies have 'everit' instead of 'everrit.' The author of the Vatican 'correctorium' (13th cent.) already conjectured that 'everrit' was the correct reading and it was accordingly adopted in the Clementine edition. The Old Latin had 'scopis mundavit.' Compare 'unoculum' in Matt. xix. 9. Is it not likely also, as Bentley conjectured, that 'tenebrarum' in xi. 36 (= σκοτεινόν) 'non habens aliquam partem tenebrarum' is a primitive error for 'tenebrosam'?

Some interest attaches to the reading of the tenses in xxii. 20, 'funditur,' 'fundetur' ('effundetur'). The former corresponds with the Greek ἐκχυννόμενον. In the three Gospels the MSS. are divided variously between the two readings. The confusion between present and future of the third conjugation is very frequent. We have it in this very verb in v. 37, where the original is ἐκχυθήσεται and some MSS. have 'effunditur.' In xi. 17 there is practically a consensus for 'cadet' (πίπτει). There indeed many MSS. have also 'desolabitur' for ἐρημοῦται. In both words the editors adopt the reading which conforms to the Greek, rightly disre-

garding the consensus for 'cadet.' In xii. 42 it is not easy to say whether 'constituit' for 'constituet' has a similar origin or represents the Greek future, which has got into some few copies from the parallel in St. Matthew. In the present case then (xxii. 20) it seems natural to suppose that the original reading was the present in agreement with the Greek. But when once a scribe found the future in one or two copies he would be very likely to prefer it (if he did not consult the Greek) as more appropriate to the occasion on which the words were spoken. The same consideration would account for its adoption in the Liturgies, which again would influence copyists. That this is the true account is certainly confirmed, if not proved, by the fact that 'datur' is universally read in v. 19. If the translator designedly wrote the future in v. 20, why not also in v. 19? But 'datur' gave no occasion for the clerical error. The Liturgies adopt 'tradetur' from 1 Cor. xi. 24 where there is a similar variety, 'tradetur,' 'traditur' as well as 'frangetur,' 'frangitur.' So also in St. Luke xxii. 22 (and parallels) a great majority of MSS. have 'tradetur,' the Greek being παραδίδοται. The present editors adopt the present tense in both verses in St. Matthew and St. Mark, but the future in St. Luke. Surely in such a case it is very much a matter of accident on which side the majority of MSS. happens to fall. A notable instance of a clerical error being adopted in a considerable majority of MSS. is 'suspiciens' for 'suscipiens' (ὑπολαβών) in x. 30. The converse error is found in a few MSS. in xix. 5 (the narrative of Zaccheus), viz. 'suscipiens' for 'suspiciens' (ἀναβλέψας).

A curious instance of a marginal gloss intruding into the text occurs in more than one MS. xxiii. 15 'in alio sic remisit eum ad uos nam remisit uos ad illum,' or as it is in another MS. 'in aliquo remisit enim eum ad nos nam remisit uos ad illum.'

T. K. ABBOTT.

#### ALY'S LIFE AND CHARACTER OF CICERO.

*Cicero, Sein Leben u. Seine Schriften*, von FRIEDRICH ALY. Berlin: 1891. R. Gärtner. Mk. 3.60.

It was perhaps inevitable that after the indiscriminating homage of generations of 'Ciceroniani' (if we may extend the meaning of the term) a Nemesis should follow;

that Middleton should make way for Mommsen. Either view is alike bound to irritate us, when we return to the facts themselves. We are tempted to say of a mixed character such as Cicero's—

Odi et amo: cur id fiat, fortasse requiris:  
Nescio: sed fieri sentio, et excrucior.

It is the partisanship of historians, friendly and hostile, which is to blame if a great name suffers temporary injustice. But in the end time may be trusted to trim the balance. We are probably not far from a final estimate of Cicero's life and character, which has been attempted with considerable success in the monograph before us. Cicero is no longer a 'fallen greatness': the 'caricature' of Drumann and the 'piquant but malicious portraiture' of Mommsen are set aside. At the same time faults and failures of character are recognized.

Dr. Aly holds that 'it was the misfortune of Cicero's life that he turned his attention to a political career' (p. 190). It was by a sort of irony of Fate that he won a marvellous triumph in attaining the consulate, the goal of his ambition, '*suo anno*'; and that having attained it he was confirmed for ever in the conviction of his own political capacity by his success in crushing the Catilinarian conspiracy. This latter success ushered in a melancholy train of consequences, the ruin of his future peace. He was no man of blood and iron, to will and to do ruthlessly and recklessly. Dr. Aly notes his *receptivity*, an openness to every external influence, as a serious bar to his political success. There is a good deal in this: it is in his statesmanship the counterpart of his eclecticism in philosophy; it involves vacillation between conflicting claims and interests, a constant 'respecting of persons,' an incapacity to distinguish the true drift of events, as contrasted with the unerring instinct of a Caesar. Dr. Aly might have observed, in confirmation of this view, that as soon as events had simplified the issue, in the death-struggle of the Republic after Julius Caesar's assassination, Cicero stood for the first and last time as a resolute and able leader. His irresolution had been intellectual and not moral.

The only novel contribution which Dr. Aly offers to the political history of this period is his characterization of M. Brutus. He was the 'hard-hearted usurer,' whose creature, the vampire Scaptius, had wrung interest at 45 per cent. (it should be 48 per cent., *ad Att.* v. 21 § 11) from the wretched people of Salamis. His pitiful selfishness wrapt itself in the philosopher's mantle. He joined Pompeius at the last moment, deserted him in the first moment of defeat, and betrayed the direction of his flight. He was loaded with honours by Caesar, whose heir he expected to become. Disappointment threw him into the arms of Cassius. He imposed on Cicero, who dedicated six

treatises to him, as the type of an upright republican. Afterwards he goes to the East, leaving the interests of the patriotic party at Rome in the sole charge of Cicero: and the two books of the *Epistolae ad M. Brutum*, which Dr. Aly considers authentic, do little to redeem his character from the charge of selfish apathy. In vain Cicero implores him to return and rally the forces of freedom. He had embroiled Cicero with Antonius, and he abandoned him to his vengeance. To this formidable indictment might have been added the fact that M. Brutus 'did not blush to govern Cisalpine Gaul for Caesar, while his uncle still held Utica against him' (Merivale ii. 449, *Cic. Orat.* § 34): showing himself however a model administrator.

This is a view which is not likely to be generally endorsed. It leaves out of account those elements in the character of Brutus, which unquestionably commanded the respect of many and very different men. The view of Shakespeare is a truer one. Brutus was academic in his idealism and pedantic in his morality. A morose insistence on his private rights as a money-lender, a morbid conviction of his public duty as a Brutus, led him alike into crimes which were in truth not the exaggeration but the perversion of his principles. They were the crimes of a fanatic. This was the meaning of Caesar's words about him, *Quiequid vult, ualde vult*.

We should have liked a fuller treatment of the relations between Caesar and Cicero. In what did the spell exerted by the one on the other consist? For Cicero rebels against it and finally shakes himself free from it, but in a way which reflects more unfavourably upon his character than almost anything else in his life. But Dr. Aly sums up the matter thus: 'to have misunderstood Caesar is Cicero's first and only error, and one which exhibits his political insight in a bad light, his love of country in an honourable light,' p. 106.

So of his relation with Atticus. And generally, the *Letters* are not laid under contribution to the same extent as the rest of his works. It is from these that the most serious charges of insincerity, duplicity, or inconsistency are drawn: and a Life of Cicero should meet these fairly. It is perhaps on principle that Dr. Aly ignores much. He rightly denounces the belittling of a great man's life, to which so much of modern biography devotes its energies somewhat after the manner of Suetonius. 'This rummaging in waste-paper baskets

exhibits not the genuine scientific spirit, but a paltry curiosity.'

Cicero's vanity is a weakness which 'every schoolboy' has discovered. His self-worship was indeed carried to the pitch of fanaticism (p. 63). 'Fortunately only a few fragments of his panegyric verse have come down to us': but his Speeches afford only too much illustration. His biographer pleads that the veto interposed by Metellus Nepos (Dec. 31, B.C. 63) had put him on his mettle, that in the waning of his greatness he lived on the glory of his 'annus mirabilis', that he compensated himself by the luxury of self-laudation for the sufferings entailed on him by his action against the Catilinarians. The damaging fact remains that he prided himself on his weak points rather than on his real strength. With regard to the Catilinarian business Dr. Aly well remarks that posterity condemns in a Cicero what it will condone in a Caesar.

We look in vain, however, for any discussion of the legal question involved in the execution of the conspirators. Points of this kind are generally ignored. The wide range of the book, including a separate notice of each of the orator's works, perhaps precludes it. Thus the *pro Cluentio* is dismissed with an expression of wonder that Cicero ever undertook such a case: the writer ignores its political interest to equestrian indices. He is totally unaware of Prof. E. S. Beesly's attempt to whitewash Catilina: such a 'Rettung' has not been attempted, even in our days! (p. 47).

Space forbids us to criticize the estimate offered of Cicero's philosophical works. It is true doubtless that they are in themselves

of less permanent value than his rhetorical treatises: true also that indirectly they are invaluable as preserving to us much of the post-Aristotelian philosophy which might otherwise have perished. The reaction of Cicero's theory of knowledge (that of the New Academy) upon his oratory is noticed (p. 13) and might well be expanded into a treatise. The statement that 'his philosophy is always only a means to an end' (p. 22) appears to us to leave out of account much that is afterwards conceded; unless we complete the statement by saying that this end was *οὐ γνώσις ἀλλὰ πράξις*. Cicero had no taste for metaphysics. His task was to popularize, to give the results rather than pursue the reasoning of the great philosophers. But he had an enthusiasm for virtue; and Dr. Aly does well to assign him, in recognition of the *de Natura Deorum*, 'an honourable place in the history of religious philosophy.'

The writer has, in his own words, dispensed with 'the ballast of learned notes': with all references, analyses of chapters, marginal headings and the like. This seriously detracts from the practical value of the work to scholars. But it was evidently written with a purpose: to contribute evidence, accessible to all, of the permanent interest of the study of Latin, in view of the attacks made upon it in the Schul-Konferenz of 1890. From this point of view Dr. Aly has set an example to the defenders of a classical training, which we may hope that English scholars may follow more frequently than has hitherto been the case.

W. Y. FAUSSET.

#### RÖNSTRÖM ON THE STRUCTURE OF VERGIL'S HEXAMETER.

*Metri Vergiliani recensio.* Scripsit Th. O. JOH. RÖNSTRÖM, Philosophiae Doctor. Lundae: 1892. Typis Malmströmianis.

THIS short but valuable treatise deals with the structure of Vergil's hexameter: its various rhythms, its phases and closes, whether normal or abnormal, in fact all the stock in trade of the great master of melody is here rigidly dissected and illustrated by examples. The work seems to have been done thoroughly; the references are accurate, and the quotations well arranged. Inter-

esting remarks abound. Thus the author sees in Vergil's spondaic endings with Greek proper names (such as *Oriona*, *Anchiseo*) the influence of Catullus: thus too he observes that hypermetrical lines which are affected by Roman poets are avoided by the Greeks. A collection of Vergil's hypermeters reveals that the superfluous syllable is usually *-que* (cp. Kennedy's *Vergil*, p. 578); often the form *-que -que* is used as in *Aen.* ii. 745 *hominumque deorumque*. Here is Dr. Rönström's inference from this fact: 'Iam vero cum haec iteratio iis omnibus locis

cernatur, ubi diremptio sententiarum post priorem versum interpunctione significatur, credendum videtur illius iterationis ipsius causa hac licentia usum esse poetam, non versuum coniungendorum causa. Retineri igitur non potest epicus noster, quin etiam tum *que* encliticam iteret, ut assolet, cum una syllaba longior fiat versus. Quamobrem alienum non est putare hunc usum hypermetrorum versuum in elegantia et venustate quamdam ponendum esse, qua poeta decus versibus addere voluerit' (p. 15). It is amazing how before the advances of research the licentious poet, imagined of schoolboys, insensibly discovers himself as the friend of order and subject of law.

The monosyllabic endings of lines are neatly assorted; these we find that the poet employs sometimes for sonorous effect, sometimes for emphasis, and sometimes to produce an archaic colour. Ionic a minori closes are rare in Vergil, such as *animanque, terebintho*; they are chiefly confined to Greek proper names. Dr. Rönström supplies full references on this and on many other points.

It is a pity that Dr. Rönström did not add to the completeness of his work by a full account of that branch of Vergil's prosody which concerns the quantities of letters and syllables. Vergil writes *quas non oraveris urbes* (*Aen.* vi. 92), Horace *dixeris esse satis*

(*Sat.* i. 4, 41, cp. ii. 3, 220), but Ovid *dederis in carmina vires* (*Fust.* i. 17); it would have been instructive to see how so excellent a metrist would have discussed this question. Indeed the whole subject of Roman prosody requires a methodical treatment. Some scholar with leisure at his command would confer a great boon by compiling a complete digest of Latin prosody. The nature of the Saturnian, the metres of Plautus and Terence, the prosody of Catullus and Lucretius, of Vergil and Horace, of Phaedrus and the elegiac poets, of Manilius, of the poets of the silver age and the decadence, would afford a noble field for the application of exact knowledge. Why are we in England inundated with school editions of Vergil and Cicero and Livy, tedious repetitions of perfectly ascertained facts, when so many questions connected with the classics remain unexplored or only partially investigated? Alas! the siren bookseller is too much with us; our younger scholars listen mainly to the music of his familiar exhortation—*O cives, quaerenda pecunia primum est*. Dr. Rönström has broken fruitful ground; Sweden speaking through him may perhaps suggest to England better things.

S. G. OWEN.

#### STATIUS.

*De P. Papirii Statii Thebaide*: scripsit  
RUDOLPHUS HELM, Dr. Phil. Berolini, apud  
Mayerum et Mullerum. 1892.

Up to the end of last century Statius was reckoned one of the considerable poets of the world. Then a change took place. The new interest in science and in the most imaginative kind of poetry—things which are Greek—cast into the shade the more rhetorical literature of Rome. Statius' master, Virgil, his acknowledged superior—

of my flame  
those sparkles were the seeds, which I  
derived  
from the bright fountain of celestial fire  
that feeds unnumbered lamps: the song I  
mean

which sounds Aeneas' wanderings—<sup>1</sup>

was depreciated in comparison with the more natural and simple Homer: and for

<sup>1</sup> Dante, *Purgatorio* xxi. (Cary's translation).

Statius himself the change meant extinction. He ceased to be read except by a few scholars and specialists. This fate was not altogether deserved, though it is difficult to see how it can be reversed. Statius labours under an accidental disadvantage. He wrote for an audience which knew well all the names and stories of Greek mythology, and he could be allusive without being obscure: but ignorance of these stories is now becoming more and more common. When Statius writes:—

quis non in funera cunctos  
Heliadum ramos lacrimosaque germina duxit  
et Phrygium silicem atque austum contraria  
Phoebo  
carmina nec foeda gavissam Pallada buxo?—  
(*Silvae* v. 3, 85 f.)

there are few schoolboys who would recognize quickly the stories of the sisters of Phæthon, Niobe, and Marsyas: and the invention of the flute by Athena is still less



familiar.<sup>1</sup> Besides this allusiveness Statius no doubt has positive faults, such as misplaced ingenuity and misplaced inflation of style: 'tumidus poeta' he has been called 'et omnia ridicule exaggerans.' But these faults do not pervade all his work: much of it is subtle, pleasing and graceful in a high degree.

Dr. Helm has set himself to investigate the obligations of Statius to earlier poets. Is this a profitable enquiry, and does it yield any interesting results? Nothing, it must be said, that quite justifies a dissertation of some 200 pages, but still some points worth noting. Homer, it appears, is directly imitated by Statius in many passages: for instance in *Theb.* vii. 261 f. there is frequent translation from the Νέων Κράλλος. Virgil, therefore, has not yet entirely supplanted the Greek poet, as he did in later centuries. But Statius, no doubt, had special reason to be acquainted with the poets of Greece. His father lectured upon them, he tells us in the *Silvae*, not merely expounding the lyric poets and explaining the principles of the Pindaric strophe—

qua lege recurat

Pindaricae vox flexa lyrae—

(*Silv.* v. 3, 151)

but also giving a paraphrase in prose of Homer, which reproduced all the force and fire of the original:—

tu par adsuetus Homero

ferre iugum senosque pedes æquare solutis  
versibus et nunquam passu brevior re-  
linqui.<sup>2</sup>

It is not surprising that the son knows his Homer. Statius appears to have seen the force and picturesqueness of a touch in the Homeric Doloneia, an idea which some critics made away with by excision of a line—*Iliad* x. 496—

κακὸν γὰρ ὄναρ κεφαλῇφιν ἐπέστη  
τῇν νύκτ' Οἰνείδαο παῖς διὰ μῆτιν Ἀθρήης—

<sup>1</sup> Heinsius' 'foeda' seems the best word to read in the passage (fida MSS., fissa, vieta, al.). 'Athena who rejoiced not in the deforming flute'—who rejected it because it distorted her face—is an allusion to the δυσόφθαλμον αἰσχός which was the alleged cause of its rejection (v. Telestes, *fr.* i., Bergk. *Poet. Lyr.* vol. iii.).

<sup>2</sup> i.e. keeping stride with Homer. He was the 'Butcher and Lang' of the first century. 'verbis' for 'versibus' is one of Bährens' unfortunate conjectures. 'versus soluti' are verses with the metre taken out, i.e. prose: 'verba soluta' would presumably mean letters or syllables!

for in the *Thebais* he writes:—

fors illi praesaga quies, nigrasque gravatus  
per somnum Thebas et Thiodamanta vide-  
bat  
(*Theb.* x. 324).

Passing to Latin poets, Dr. Helm finds that Statius took some hints from the plays of Seneca (*Oedipus* and *Phoenissae*)—Seneca having followed Euripides, whom Statius does not directly imitate. Statius also owed something to Ovid: compare *Ov. Met.* iii. 32 f. with *Stat. Theb.* v. 508 f., and *Met.* xi. 589 with *Theb.* x. 80 f. (the cave of Somnus). This examination results in showing the superiority of Ovid, who 'ut homo vere poeta' is more simple, natural and picturesque than his successor (Helm, pp. 59–67). The influence of Lucretius appears chiefly in the Invocation of the Earth-goddess, *Theb.* viii. 303 f., which is modelled on the Address to Venus. But it is to Virgil that Statius owes the largest debt; he constantly follows him in language, incident and versification. In the plot and structure of the epic Virgil's influence would seem to have been sometimes harmful. The fact that warfare begins in the seventh book of Virgil caused Statius to reserve the actual siege of Thebes for the same point in his poem, with the result that in the first six books the action drags a little and there is much that is not very important for the main story. Here however Statius had Epic precedent, for Antimachus of Colophon is said to have expanded the same theme with such skill 'ut xxiv. volumina impleret antequam septem duces usque ad Thebas duceret.' Further, imitation of Virgil's eighth book (*Aeneas* and *Evander*) has made Statius' first book obscure and inconsistent—it is night at the outset, but this is forgotten and we have a feast by day as in the *Aeneid*. Dr. Helm next proceeds to discuss various passages of doubtful authenticity, acting on the admirable principle 'libidini, qua viri docti quicquid ipsis displicet poetae adimere non verentur, quod eius per vires nostras fieri posset, obsistere' (p. 149). He then deals briefly with the relations of Statius to Lucan and Valerius Flaccus, both of whom died before the *Thebais* was written ('ante Thebaidem editam aut inceptam,' p. 150), and discusses at greater length the connexion between the work of Statius and that of his contemporary Silius, whose claims to priority are more doubtful, bringing his essay to a close with an encomium upon Statius, whom he places above Virgil in the art of delineating

character, and above Silius, Flaccus, and Lucan in the art of constructing an Epic narrative.

The whole enquiry is a somewhat unattractive one. You do not account for or exhaust the qualities of a poet by tabulating the passages which have influenced him 'any more,' as Goethe said, 'than you explain away the strength of a strong man by reckoning up the nourishing food which he has eaten.' Echoes or reminiscences of an earlier poet are things which an instructed reader will feel; but there is no good reason for collecting and analyzing them at length. A long dissertation could be justified only by unusual insight or by a successful attempt to make the two poets illustrate and explain each other: and though Dr. Helm does not descend to the level of the scholar (Friesemann) who proposed 'arcano fulgentes lumine postes' in *Theb.* i. 210,

forgetting the Virgilian 'florentes aere catervas,' he does not seem to be acutely sensitive to the recurrence of a Virgilian cadence (e.g. on p. 27 he quotes 'unde haec tam clara repente | numina,' *Theb.* x. 236, apparently without any suspicion that it is an echo of 'unde haec tam clara repente | tempestas'), and he sometimes misses the obvious in his reading of Statius, e.g. on p. 42 he does not quote Oedipus' speech to the end, although the last words make his point much clearer—'modo digna veni, mea pignora nosces,' 'come but in thy full malignity, and thou wilt find them true sons of mine': this speech, he wishes to show, has reminiscences of Seneca, who had written

agite, o propago cara, generosam indolem  
probate factis.

W. R. HARDIE.

#### A. COLLIGNON ON PETRONIUS.

*Étude sur Pétrone; la critique littéraire, l'imitation et la parodie dans le Satiricon.*

A. COLLIGNON. Pp. viii. + 406. Paris: Hachette. 1892.

M. COLLIGNON's study is chiefly concerned, as his second title indicates, with the relation of Petronius, as critic or imitator, to other authors and forms of literature.

Chap. I. (pp. 1-49) deals with the analysis and form of the *Satiricon*, and with its place in Roman literature. There is little in this chapter that calls for remark, except the statement on p. 5, note 1, that the Tran MS. begins with the words *Ipse nescit quid habeat* c. 37. The MS. really begins with the words *venerat iam tertius dies* c. 26. The results which the author draws from his comparison of the *Satiricon* with the *Menippean Satires* of Varro, the *Ἀποκολοκύντωσις* of Seneca, the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius and the Greek novels are not in any degree new. On the

other hand, the important suggestion of Elimar Klebs (*Philologus* xlvii. 623 ff.) that the wrath of Priapus incurred by Encolpius served as a *Leitmotiv* to give unity to the composition, is relegated to a footnote on p. 8, although quoted with approval; it reappears in a position of greater honour on p. 323. It was scarcely necessary to waste words on the theory that the *Satiricon* is identical with the sealed document despatched by Petronius to Nero.

Chap. II. (pp. 51-108) proves, at considerable length, that Petronius was an Epicurean in morals and religion, and a supporter of the 'Classical' theory in literature. This part of the book would be improved by compression. The passages of Petronius which contain literary criticisms (cc. 1-5, 88, 116) are printed at full length, with illustrations from other authors in parallel columns. These are sometimes filled with unnecessarily diffuse references, e.g.

Sumendae voces a plebe semotae, ut fiat 'odi profanum vulgus et arceo.'

La citation d'Horace: *Odi profanum, &c.*, est tirée de l'Ode I. du livre III., vers 1.

Most of c. 118 is treated *twice* in this manner.

Chap. III. attacks the question of parody and imitation in the *Satiricon*, with special reference to the 'Troiae halosis' and the 'de bello civili.' As to the first, M. Collignon concludes, no doubt rightly, that there is no intention of parodying Vergil,

and adopts the opinion of M. Souriau (and others) that Petronius utilized an exercise in the free adaptation of themes already treated by classical authors, which he considered of sufficient merit to be put into the mouth of Eumolpus. Little, however, is gained by printing the poem at length, with interspersed quotations from Vergil which

correspond more or less closely in sense or expression. There is no excuse for such *rapprochements* as the following:

13. Hoc ad furta compositus Sinon

14. Firmabat et mens semper in damnum potens.

II. 54. *si mens non laeva fuisset.*

22. ictusque resilit et dolis addit fidem.

II. 43. *aut ulla putatis*

*dona curere dolis Danavum?*

M. Collignon next discusses the interesting question as to the relation of the poem 'de bello civili' to the *Pharsalia* of Lucan. This problem has called forth several expressions of opinion within recent years. For a long period, the discussion was almost confined to the writings of Justin Mössler,<sup>1</sup> who in a series of dissertations endeavoured to prove that Petronius' poem was intended as a criticism in detail of the opening portion of the *Pharsalia*. He assumed that Petronius was acquainted with the first three books only of the *Pharsalia*, i.e. with those published during Lucan's lifetime. As Lucan's death falls in 65 A.D. and that of Petronius (if he be identical with the courtier of Nero) in the following year, it would seem highly improbable that the latter could have used the last seven books of the *Pharsalia*, which, according to the 'Vita Lucani' of Vacca, were published after the poet's death. Westerbürg, however, who in *Rheinisches Museum* 1883, pp. 93-96, upheld the theory that Petronius intended to parody and travesty Lucan, and at the same time to ridicule the critics who blamed the absence of epic machinery in the *Pharsalia*, detected, as he supposed, traces of the influence of book vii. on the poem of Petronius, and concluded that that author had heard the seventh book at a recitation during Lucan's lifetime. Westerbürg's theory, however, found no favour with scholars, and was unhesitatingly condemned by Friedländer (*Bursian's Jahresberichte* 1886, p. 196), Jeep (*ibid.* 1890, p. 182) and Klebs (*Philologus* xlvii. p. 631). Friedländer, in the *Jahresberichte* for 1892, p. 163, expresses his agreement with the last-named scholar, that 'the purpose of the "carmen de bello civili" is simply to put into practice the requirement that for the painfully accurate handling of history a free and poetical treatment should be substituted, and the reduction of events to their causes replaced by the intervention of divine powers.'

<sup>1</sup> Besides the four dissertations enumerated by M. Collignon on p. 190, a fifth was posthumously published in *Philologus* l. p. 722 sqq. Mössler died in 1874.

Similar opinions have been expressed within the last year by Ribbeck, in the last volume of his *History of Roman Poetry*, pp. 125, 163 ('The poem as a whole does not claim to be an elaborated work of art, but is merely intended to illustrate the theoretical position of the writer. All idea of ridicule is completely absent.') and Schanz, in the second volume of his *History of Roman Literature*, p. 291 ('The question arises whether the interlude is a parody (travesty) or an illustrative example of the theory set forth. We must decide in favour of the latter alternative: for the intervention of divine powers is consistently carried through, in opposition to Lucan, who disdains the use of the "apparatus mythologicus."'). With this, which may now be considered the orthodox view M. Collignon is in substantial agreement, regarding the poem as an exercise, probably of Petronius' earlier years, consisting in the adaptation of a part of the *Pharsalia* to the requirements of the traditional school of Epic poetry. Again we have the parallel passages drawn out in great detail, and here it is impossible to follow M. Collignon, who not only sees traces of the influence of book vii. of the *Pharsalia*, but also of various other books of that poem. It may with safety be asserted that not one of the passages quoted proves that Petronius was acquainted with any of the later books of the *Pharsalia*. One instance will be sufficient to show the nature of the parallels on which M. Collignon relies:—

187. Sed postquam turmae nimbos fregere ligatos.

IV. 50, 51. *Pigro bruma gelu, siccis Aquilonibus haerens,*

*Aethere constricto pluuias in nube tenebat.*

Comment is unnecessary. It should be noted that, if M. Collignon's thesis could be established, to the effect that 'the entire "Pharsalia" was in the hands of Petronius,' it would be well-nigh impossible to maintain the identification of the author of the *Satiricon* with the 'elegantiarum arbiter' of Nero. M. Collignon, who casts doubt upon the assumed identity of the two personages, fails to make the use which might be expected of this argument; for, although on p. 357 we read 'It is more than probable that Petronius knew the whole *Pharsalia* and not merely the first three books, the only ones published in the lifetime of Lucan'—who, be it remembered, died only a year before Petronius—he writes on the next page, 'These imitations cannot then serve to establish a date,' and leaves the question unsettled.

In Chap. IV. (pp. 227-326) are collected the reminiscences of earlier authors found in Petronius. Some interesting parallels are here drawn, and we are not surprised to find that the writer who speaks of 'Horatii curiosa felicitas' should betray, often by the use of a single word or short phrase, his intimate acquaintance with the diction of the earlier poet. Reminiscences of Ovid are also not infrequent. But in this case, as in others, M. Collignon's lists of parallels are

often the result of uncritical compilation. He justly criticizes Gottschlich for tracing the influence of Seneca in the use of the formula *I nunc et...*, and quotes instances from Horace, Juvenal, and Vergil, although omitting that which is perhaps the earliest, Prop. ii. 29, 22. It is therefore somewhat surprising to meet with the following within a few pages (in a list of phrases common to Petronius and the Ἀποκολύντωσις):—

Petr. chap. 44, l. 8. non...buccam panis inuenire potui.  
chap. 43, l. 26. Durae buccae fuit, linguosus.  
chap. 64, p. 43, l. 20. Bucca, bucca, quot sunt hic?  
chap. 70, l. 5. Ad buccam.

Sen. Apokol. i. 7. Dicam quod mihi in buccam uenerit.

The above speaks for itself. On the other hand, some curious and instructive parallels are absent. M. Collignon complains of the scarcity of parallels between the work of Petronius and the *Menippean Satires* of Varro: yet he omits the following:—

Petr. c. 46, l. 19 uolo illum ad domusionem aliquid de iure gustare; c. 48, l. 30 in domusionem tamen literas didici.

Varro, *Sat. Men.* fr. 517. Diogenem literas scisse, domusioni quod satis esset.

As M. Collignon does not shrink from enumerating expressions which Petronius and Seneca independently borrowed from the common stock of colloquial Latin, he might have noticed the pleonastic use of *incipere uelle* (or *coepi uelle*), which occurs in the Ἀποκολύντωσις c. 14 (*incipit patronus uelle respondere*), and is found three times in the *Satiricon*<sup>1</sup> (cc. 9, 70, 98).

Pp. 312-326 are devoted to the Greek sources of Petronius; but no very tangible result is arrived at. On p. 322, note 1, one or two parallels are drawn from Herodas, and points of general similarity between the Μυρίαμβοι and the work of Petronius are justly indicated. To the parallels may be added the use of ποδόψηστρον by Herodas (v. 30) as compared with Petr. c. 57, l. 3 (cp. c. 27, l. 37). The position of Gastron in the fifth Μυρίαμβος reminds us forcibly of the early days of Trimalchio (c. 69, l. 16, 76, l. 20). Crusius, however, goes much too far when, in comparing Herodas v. 27 ἀνθρώπος εἰμ', ἡμαρτον with Petr. c. 75, l. 2 homines sumus, non dei, he says 'the coincidence is not due to chance.' The phrase is merely proverbial; see Otto,

<sup>1</sup> Oddly enough, Friedländer's note on the use is attached to a passage where it does not occur in the text of Petronius, but is printed without a word of explanation in the 'lemma.'

*Sprichwörter*, s. v. homo 2, where to the quotations from Petronius, Pliny the younger (*Epp.* v. 3, 2) and Juvenal (vi. 283) should be added Plin. *N. H.* Praef. 18, *Homines enim sumus et occupati officii*. This leads me to mention a turn of expression which, belonging originally to colloquial language, forces its way into elevated prose soon after the time of Petronius, having been previously almost wholly confined to comedy, epistolary prose, and other styles of composition where colloquial expressions were in place. I refer to the use of the negative in comparisons, which is specially frequent in the case of ἀνθρωπος—homo. As the instances hitherto collected are somewhat widely dispersed in commentaries &c., I subjoin the following list of those in which ἀνθρωπος or homo (mulier) forms a term of comparison:—Philemon *fr. incert.* 155 Κοκκ στρατιῶτα κοῖκ ἀνθρώπε, Menander Ὀργή *fr.* 363 Κτήσιππος οὐκ ἀνθρωπος, Krobylos *fr. incert.* 8 κάμνος οὐκ ἀνθρωπος, Plaut. *Stich.* i. 2, 7 non homines sed sues, *Asin.* ii. 4, 88 lupus non homo, Ter. *Hec.* ii. 1, 17 lapidem non hominem, Cic. *Att.* i. 18, 1 non homo sed 'litus atque aer et solitudo mera,' Pis. *fr.* 6 beluam non hominem, *Att.* vii. 13, 6 non hominem sed scopas solutas, M. Plotius Sacerdos p. 461, 30 K (of Pompey) non homo sed ropio, Catull. cxv. 8 non homo sed mentula, Petron. 38 phantasia non homo, 43 discordia non homo, 44 piper non homo, 74 codex non mulier, Plin. *N. H.* xxxv. 81 non hominem sed iracundiam (omitted in the lists), Quint. x. 1, 112 (Cicero) non iam hominis nomen sed eloquentiae habeatur (omitted in the lists), Schol. Juv. iv. 77 (of Pegasus) liber uulgo non homo diceretur, Lucian, *Dial. Mar.* 12, 2 λίθος, οὐκ ἀνθρωπος, Jul. Capitol. Balb. et Max. 11, 1 non hominem sed Cyclopem, Vopise. Bon. 15, 2 amphoram non



hominem, Amm. Marc. xvii. 11, 1 capella non homo. (Apul. *Met.* viii. 25 has been quoted, but is not a true instance. Laberius *fr.* 47 Ribbeck and Cic. *Q. fr.* ii. 9, 3 are less direct parallels.) The chronological arrangement will illustrate the remark made above as to the history of the expression.

Comparatively few cases are as yet collected in which *homo* does not form a term of comparison: Petronius and Herodas, however, both figure in the list:—Philemon *fr. incert.* 123 σφίγγ' ἄρρεν', οὐ μάγειρον, Herodas vi. 4 λίθος, οὐ δούλη, 72 ἐπὶ, οὐχ ἰμ[άντες], Theoc. xv. 8 εἰλεόν, οὐκ οἰκισιν, Asklepiades, *Anth. Pal.* v. 181 ληστὴν, οὐ θράποντ', Petron. 58 mufrius non magister, 134 lorum in aqua non inguina Mart. x. 55, 7 non manus sed statera (omitted in previous lists).

M. Collignon is not indisposed to believe that Petronius may have borrowed the framework of his story from a Greek realistic novel for which he would suggest the title Πριαπεία. Bücheler, in a private communication quoted on p. 324, note 1, inclines to the same view, but suggests *Μασσιλιωτικά* as the title. The question as to the existence of such novels is, however, at present unsettled. M. Collignon appears not to be acquainted with Thiele's article in *Aus der Anomia* (1890), in which an unsuccessful attempt is made to deduce the existence of this class of literature from a passage in Cornificius *ad Her.* i. 8, closely paralleled by Cic. *Inv.* i. 19. More recently a controversy has arisen between Th. Bürger (*Hermes* xxvii. 345 ff.), who seeks to prove that the *Μαλιστακά* of Aristides and similar works (*v. Ov. Trist.* ii. 412 ff.) were not collections of tales but actual novels, and Rohde (*Rheinisches Museum* xlviii. 125 ff.), who defends the position which he laid down (*Der griechische Roman*) to the effect that the realistic novel is unknown in Greek literature, and that an impassable gulf separates the *Novellen* of Aristides and others from the romances of the Second Sophistic. He seems to have the best of the argument, nor does it appear to me that, if we adopt Klebs' attractive theory as to the influence of Priapus in determining the successive adventures of Encolpius, we are obliged to assume that Petronius adopted

Petron. c. 37, l. 10 quemuis ex istis babaecalis in rutae folium conciet.

C. 39, l. 6 hoc unum inquit nos oportet suave faciatis (cp. 48, l. 3).

On the whole our verdict must be that the book suffers from undue expansion and lack

the motive from a Greek author, nor that his own originality may not have led him thus to parody the wanderings of Odysseus pursued by the wrath of Poseidon. (That this was the intention of the author may be inferred from certain touches of detail in cc. 97, 105, 127, 132, noticed in M. Collignon's book pp. 317-319.)

In the last chapter the author seeks to draw conclusions, which are chiefly of a negative character. He is extremely sceptical as to the identification of Petronius Arbiter with the 'arbiter elegantiae' of Tacitus. He finds insuperable difficulties in believing either (1) that 'Arbiter' was the true cognomen of C. Petronius, on which Tacitus hazarded a pun, or (2) that a later age baptized the author of the *Satiricon* Arbiter in allusion to the words of the historian. As to (1) the theory of Bücheler (now supported by Ribbeck<sup>1</sup>) is not that Tacitus was the author of the play on words, but that he embedded in his text the phrase current at Nero's court; while with regard to (2)—the explanation of Mommsen, to which Schanz<sup>2</sup> has recently given a qualified adhesion—it may be observed that the cognomen appears in no ancient author earlier than Terentianus Maurus, which leaves an ample interval for the process assumed to have taken place. Neither theory seems to have taken place. Neither theory seems to present unsurmountable difficulties.

On p. 328 we read that 'Gerhard had already demonstrated the importance of the words in c. 126, p. 94, l. 16: *Osculum quale Praxiteles habere Dianam credidit*, which are justified by the Artemis Colonna of the Berlin Museum.' The identification has little in its favour, and it seems highly probable that the text should be corrected so as to make Petronius refer to the Cnidian Aphrodite. Otto Jahn suggested Cnidiam or Dionem, Meyer Dionam, Bücheler (ed. min.) deam (= Cnidiam). See Studniczka, *Vermutungen zur griechischen Kunstgeschichte*, p. 36.

The book ends with appendices on the fragments of Petronius, and coincidences in expression with Martial and Juvenal, to which might be added:—

Martial xi. 31, 16

ut condat uario uasfer sapore  
in rutae folium Capellianae.

v. 78, 16 unum tu facies bonum bibendo.

of arrangement, while in some respects it is singularly uncritical. H. STUART JONES.

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der röm. Dichtung* iii. 168.

<sup>2</sup> *Geschichte der röm. Litteratur* ii. 297.

GOUUMY'S *LES LATINS*.

*Les Latins*. Par EDOUARD GOUUMY. Paris :  
Hachette et Cie. 3 fr.50.

It is to be inferred from M. Goumy's posthumous work that he was not ardently devoted to the form of his country's constitution : one leading note of these essays being a strong *parti pris* for Caesarism, or at least an antipathy to the republican institutions of Rome. For the rest, they are brightly and pleasantly written, if not always to be taken quite seriously : and are in fact—if M. Goumy's *mot* about the *De Amicitia* and *De Senectute* may be applied to himself—'*Declamatiunculae non sans quelque agrément*.' The preface states that the author had no intention of writing a history of Latin literature : literary criticism pure and simple plays a subordinate part : by *Les Latins* are meant not only the works but also the men, much more in fact the latter than the former. We deduce the personality and motives of an author from his own writings—a much more immediately interesting process, as offering a wide field for speculation, than a merely impersonal survey of so many pages of verse or prose. This is the method of M. Gaston Boissier as a critic of Juvenal : and if the method does not always tend to the actual advancement of learning, it is at least generally amusing. M. Goumy's ingenious imagination has thus arrayed before us a very remarkable gallery of portraits,—including a Sallust who plunders his province apparently out of pure *esprit*, and a Lucretius who is a combination of St. Paul and Buffon. With Cicero the process of hypothesis will not work satisfactorily, because we know so much about him already : but that has not saved the unfortunate orator from some thirty pages of ultra-Mommsenian depreciation : after reading which one is really surprised that an author who merited '*l'écrasant arrêt de Mommsen* "*Feuilletoniste!*" should still be studied in schools. Cicero the man has always been an easy prey to those who wish to display independence of the effete judgments of antiquity. But in this instance he has been so unlucky as to fall into the

hands of a vehement anti-Republican—and even Catiline is partially whitewashed at his expense. When that conspirator was driven from the senate by Cicero's eloquence, it was apparently the expelled and not the expeller who was the real hero of the occasion.

Modern French criticism is apt to be rather exasperatingly flippant, and to treat its victims with a familiarity that generally oversteps the line of contempt. Much of *Les Latins* would be regarded as simply impertinent in English : but it is redeemed from impertinence by the amiable vivacity of the French language. The book is eminently French, not only in liveliness but in the constant comparisons between the national literature and that of Rome, usually to the disadvantage of the latter. That Terence should be placed below Molière is intelligible : and perhaps admirers of André Chenier may hold him superior to Catullus. But patriotism has its limits : and when we are told that '*Lachaud valait bien Cicéron*,' we feel that they have certainly been reached. Nevertheless the present author has often shown that he possessed a true and fine literary judgment. He is quite free from that enthusiasm for mere antiquity which has sometimes caused a very good scholar to be a very bad critic : and on the whole the essays on Virgil and Catullus show a real and genuine appreciation. They do not contain very much that is absolutely new—which indeed would be difficult—but they do contain (more especially the chapter on Virgil) a great deal of sound literary criticism. Nay, even Cicero has his meed of praise as at least a consummate artist in words : an excellence which surely might go far to justify the derided publication of speeches which no doubt have ceased after nineteen centuries to palpitate with actuality. One is sometimes tempted to wish that so sane a judge as M. Goumy had given us more criticism of style and fewer personalities : but then his book would perhaps have been less readable. Certainly it would not have been so amusing.

A. D. GODLEY.

## HOFFMAN AND JORDAN'S CATALOGUE OF THE FISHES OF GREECE.

*A Catalogue of the Fishes of Greece*, with Notes on the Names now in use and those employed by Classical Authors. By HORACE ADDISON HOFFMAN and DAVID STARR JORDAN. From the Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Science, Philadelphia, August 17th, 1892.

THIS is a catalogue of the fishes now found in Greek waters, classified according to their families and species, with the ancient and modern Greek names of each fish (when these are known), a list of the principal references made to it by classical writers and a summary of the statements made about it by them. The catalogue is based partly upon that of Apostolides (in *La Pêche en Grèce*, Athens, 1883) and partly upon collections made in Greece by Hoffman. The purely zoological portion of the paper is the work of Dr. Jordan. What is of principal interest to the classical student is of course the identifications of fish now found in Greece with those mentioned by ancient writers. In making these, much weight has evidently been attached by the authors to resemblances between ancient and modern Greek fish-names. But although the persistence of popular names of animals is undoubtedly very great, it can scarcely furnish a secure basis for identification of species. The looseness with which the common people in every age apply names is well known. To take a single example, I am assured on competent authority that in the United States the name 'sucker' is given to nearly fifty species of fish. Moreover, there is always the possibility that a

name which has remained in use since the time of Aristotle is not now applied to the same fish as in his day. Hence mere resemblance of name should not be accepted as proof of identity unless supported by other evidence. The data collected by Hoffman are however interesting, and both classical students and scientists will be grateful for them. The lists of references to the works of ancient writers and the summaries of the information given by them about particular kinds of fish are much less satisfactory. They are not complete, and doubtless were not intended to be so; but it is hard in some cases to see what principle guided the authors of the catalogue in their selection. A single example, taken at random, may suffice. Under *σάλπη* (*Boops salpa* L.) eight references to Aristotle and one to Athenaeus are given; but those to Oppian *Hal.* i. 110, Aelian ix. 7, Ovid *Hal.* 121, Pliny ix. 68, etc., from which one or two additional facts may be gleaned, are omitted entirely. To obtain a reasonably complete survey of the ancient ichthyological literature one must look elsewhere, e.g. to Günther's *Catalogue of the Acanthopterygian Fishes in the British Museum*, or even to the much older work of Salviani, *Aquatilium Animalium Historia*. The principal value of the catalogue will no doubt be as a list of the fishes now found in Greece. Of its accuracy as such only an expert can judge. But as an aid to the identification of ancient Greek fishes it is decidedly insufficient.

H. W. HAYLEY.

Harvard University.

**The Substantives of Terence.** By MOSES S. SLAUGHTER. Thesis: 1891. Johns Hopkins University.

In this dissertation we have a detailed account of the 950 substantives found in Terence, followed by a complete index of all the occurrences. A similar work by Rassow, Leipzig 1881, has enabled the writer to draw comparisons between the use of Plautus and that of Terence; with the general result that Caesar was right in characterizing Terence as *puri sermonis amator* and that the vocabulary of Terence is not far removed from the classical norm of Cicero.

The dissertation treats the substantives under these heads: proper names; ἄπαξ λεγόμενα; words first employed by Terence; Greek words; compounds; diminutives; substantives with various suffixes; nomina agentis; derivatives. The following are some of the interesting facts gathered and commented upon:—

Of the proper names Terence shows but one-eighth of Latin origin, while Plautus shows one-fourth. In the matter of ἄπαξ λεγόμενα Terence is less free than Plautus; so too in the employment of Greek words, Terence showing but one in eighteen, while Plautus shows one in nine.

Terence introduces, proportionally, almost as many new words into the Latin language as Plautus; but a much larger proportion survive in the classical time. In composition Terence prefers *con-*, while Plautus seems to prefer, *pro-*, *sub-*, or *per-*, in this showing his *sermo familiaris* leanings. Terence is quite moderate in his use of diminutives, and there seems to be a great weakening of the diminutive force of the termination. Thus while in Plautus *adulescentulus* is always a diminutive in feeling, there seems to be little if any difference between it and *adulescens* in Terence.

In general Terence is more refined in his choice of

substantial suffixes than Plautus, as is shown by the fact that in substantives with both *-tio* and *-tus* Plautus has three-fifths in *-tio*, Terence has an equal division, while classical Latin shows three-fifths in *-tus*. Abstract nouns in *-or* are not common in Terence, who has only twelve examples as compared with forty-seven in Lucretius. The accusative case after nouns in *-tio*, which occurs in Plautus some eleven times, is not found in Terence at all.

While the positive gain in a piece of work of this kind is not great, the dissertation is valuable as filling up one of the gaps in the history of the development of substantival usage in Latin.

GONZALEZ LODGE.

Bryn Mawr College.

**The Crito of Plato**, with Introduction and Notes by ST. GEORGE STOCK, M.A., Pembroke College. 16mo. pp. 31+43. Oxford. 1891. 2s.

THE editor of this little volume in the Clarendon Press series offers as 'a sufficient excuse for [its] appearance' the argument that, since Oxford prescribes books for students, 'it is but reasonable

that it should supply them with editions in which to read them.' He adds that 'the wants of candidates for Responsions have been specially kept in view,' and the needs of 'the weaker brethren,' those 'who will remain contented with a Pass,' have been remembered. After this modest introduction it would be unfair to look for independent treatment of text or interpretation. It strikes one oddly to see the *Apology* of Xenophon referred to as if there were no doubt about its authorship, and as if it were more historical than the *Apology* of Plato; and to see the *Tabula Cebetis* spoken of as unquestionably by the Socratic Kebes, and as in the 'purest Attic.' There are one or two instances of that uncertainty in accent which results from disregarding it in pronunciation (e.g. *δική τιμητός* for *δική τιμητός* in the notes on 52 C.). And an Oxford man ought not to confuse *would* and *should*, as in the sentence of the preface, 'Had I consulted Mr. Adam's edition, I would doubtless have improved my own.' In general, however, the book is probably well suited to the classes had in view.

T. D. GOODELL.

Yale University.

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

**Roman Inscriptions in Britain.** II. (1890—91) by F. HAVERFIELD, M.A. F.S.A. (Reprint from *Archaeological Journal*, vol. xlix.) Exeter. 1892.

MR. HAVERFIELD, who has taken in charge the Roman Epigraphy of Britain, has issued his annual fasciculus containing the 'finds' of 1890—91 with illustrations and necessary descriptions and comments. It is of much interest. An ingot of tin found in Cornwall with 4th century stamps proves that Cornish tin was worked in Roman times; a Carlisle tile of the IXth legion, a Devonshire tile of the IIInd legion; a silver Roman saucepan, perhaps from Sussex, once belonging to Romulus son of Camulogenus; a dedicatory tablet to Mars Medocius god of the Campeses from Lossio Veda the Caledonian 'grandson' of Vepogenus, found at Colchester; a mile-stone of the Emperor Victorinus, one of the 'Thirty Tyrants'; and a fine altar discovered at Binchester set up by one Pomponius Donatus to Jove and the Transmarine Mothers (who under the Celtic epithet of Ollototae are apparently also named on other lost Binchester altars)—all these are of historic or linguistic importance. The Roman first-century trade in saucepans pursued by the firms of Cipii, Ateii, Polybii, Ansii is noted with suggestive references and lists of finds. A number of past errors in the readings and inscrip-

tions of Roman objects are corrected in a useful appendix.

Mr. Haverfield, alike by his skill and his caution, is proving himself a master in the line of research he has taken up, and one looks with confidence to him to provide us with a work that is yearly becoming more of a need to those of us who deal with later periods of British history, namely, a history complete and exhaustive, as he can make it, of Roman Britain.<sup>1</sup> Every year fresh research into English medieval history shows increasingly the deep foundations laid by Rome in these islands, and to rightly estimate the influence of the invading Teutons, whether 4th century Saxon or Scandinavian of the 9th century, we must be able to form some kind of picture of the province as it stood in the 4th century. It will not be an easy task—the making of this ideal Romano-British history.

Meanwhile, it is something to know that the classifying and collecting of the material has fallen into capable hands, and one hopes that the appeal made for help and co-operation from all who have the good fortune to possess or discover Roman antiquities in Britain will not fall upon deaf ears. It is not very troublesome to send a post-card with news of a coin or a

<sup>1</sup> We are glad to learn from Mr. Haverfield that he is already at work on such a history.—Ed.



tile found in draining a street or digging the foundations of a house to Mr. Haverfield's address and, in these days of Kodakry, a little photograph can usually be secured of any larger object on the spot. Students of later periods can only wish that there were persons in charge, say, of pre-Conquest or 13th or 15th century English antiquities, to whom (as to Mr. Haverfield for Roman finds) notices could be addressed of fresh discoveries and who would issue periodical reports of the results.

Research is simply methodical scientific investigation and it ought to be carried out in a business-like way, in order that useless time and labour may be spared and the wearisome search through numerous scattered periodicals entrusted to one or two trustworthy persons once for all.

It may not be out of place here to direct the attention of English students to the accessible and excellent but too little known museum of Boulogne, which (besides its wonderful array of Greek vases lately published and unique Pacific-coast masks and dancing-staves) contains probably the finest existing collection of Roman glass, all found in the district, a noble series of local Roman black pottery, several large tin Roman platters, some noteworthy inscriptions relative to the *classis Britannica* and much else of value and rarity. To the enthusiasm and care of M. de Vaillant, one of Mr. Haverfield's most able correspondents, most of this Roman collection is due.

F. YORK POWELL.

## MONTHLY RECORD.

### GREAT BRITAIN.

*Silchester.*—The results of last year's excavations have been recently exhibited, the remains of pottery being especially abundant and very perfect. They consist of a dish and jug of white ware, dark Upchurch ware, highly decorated pseudo-Samian, red-glazed ware, and black ware from the New Forest and Castor; also one small dish of a rare type, slightly glazed and of a slaty hue, probably made at Kimmeridge in Dorsetshire. Of other finds may be mentioned: a graceful glass vase of amber yellow, enamelled brooches, a beautifully modelled seated bronze figure of Victory, bone pins, needles, spoons, and counters, and well-designed knife-handles of carved horn; also important remains of iron-work.

Near the supposed Christian church were discovered two much corroded metal cups, which may possibly have been used in the Christian worship. In the city-wall was found a sluice or water-gate of remarkable construction. It is proposed in the ensuing season to excavate the *insula* south of the forum,

containing the round temple, and the one still further to the south.<sup>1</sup>

*South Shields.*—From time to time tiles have been found here with the inscription C.V.G., which was explained as referring to the fifth cohort of Gauls. A stone has recently been found which confirms this explanation, together with a bronze figure about four inches high, probably of Jupiter. The inscription dates from the time of Severus Alexander (221-234 A.D.), and it is interesting to note that the latter name has been deliberately erased. The name of the *legatus pro praetore* is given as Marius Valerianus; it also occurs on inscriptions from Netherby and Chesters.<sup>1</sup>

### ITALY.

*Bologna.*—In the south-west corner of the city two blocks have been found, forming part of a pavement of hexagons laid on four substrata, viz. *pozzolana*, very hard concrete, lime formed of sand and large flints, and *opus spicatum*. It must have belonged to the floor of a public edifice, not improbably a swimming bath, as there was one on this site, built by Augustus and rebuilt by Caligula (C. I. L. xi. 720). Another pavement has also been found, bordering on an ancient street, formed of white cubes and borders of black *fasciae*.<sup>2</sup>

*Arezzo.*—Part of a *cippus* has been found, evidently belonging to a large monument of pre-Augustan date, also the ear of an ox in bronze and a coin of Faustina the younger. A very interesting discovery is that of the workshop of the potters who manufactured the famous Arretine ware; the names L. Annius and L. Nonius were previously known, and stamps have also been found bearing the names C. Annius and C. Nonius, and various moulds, the most interesting being a fragment of a decorative tablet representing a *bestiarius*, of the third century. Below the level of the buildings which formed this workshop were found an uncial *as* of the second century, and fragments of Etruscan vases of the fourth century, B.C.<sup>3</sup>

*Corneto.*—A tomb containing paintings has been recently opened in the Tarquinian necropolis, consisting of a tumulus in which is a rectangular chamber with ridged ceiling. No remains were found in the tomb. The walls are covered with white stucco, with a frieze of white, red, and blue bands. Opposite the door is a cornice like that of an altar, on which are painted a chimaera, a youth on horseback, and a bull running. On the frieze below are obscene subjects, and figures of bulls, one with a human face. The male figures are painted red, the females white, and there are inscriptions in Etruscan. Below are panels, on which are painted an armed warrior, a youth on horseback, and various plants. The paintings are in good condition, and date from about 500 B.C.<sup>2</sup>

*Chiusti.*—A mirror has been found with a representation of Thalna, Menefra, and Sime (Faunus), and two inscriptions: (1) C · ANNIVS · L · F · COELIA · GNAT | JANSIVS · ENNA · JEF, Vel(ius) Ann(ius) Coponiae?; (2) *unic vethsurus*. The latter inscription is written *boustrophedon*. A fragment of a bronze tablet was also found, with the name of an Etruscan *collegium* on one side, on the other a copy of a *lex repetundarum*; also a mosaic pavement in black and white, of Roman date. A tomb has been opened with paintings of youths and animals, and a

<sup>1</sup> *Antiquary*, April 1893.

<sup>2</sup> *Notizie dei Lincei*, August 1892.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* Oct. 1892.

marble cinerary urn has been discovered with relief representing Eteokles and Polyneikes, inscribed ΜΕΥΝΑΙ..., dating from the third century B.C.<sup>4</sup>

*Nocilara*.—Further discoveries have been made connecting the tombs with those of Numana, which are of more recent date. In one were found a skeleton, a few vases of black earthenware, two fibulae with large amber studs, such as were found in the archaic tombs of Picenum, and a bronze spear-head of primitive type, like others found at Tarquinii. These objects appear to date from the sixth century B.C.<sup>5</sup>

More recent systematic excavations have revealed the existence of a necropolis of altogether new type. A trench was dug in which were found traces of a hearth, with bones of animals and fragments of primitive vases, two scallop-shells, and a small ring of amber. Traces of habitations of a later date were also brought to light. In another trench were found four skeletons, a fibula with amber setting, and a bowl of yellow clay. Most of the tombs had been plundered, but in others were found a few small vases of black ware, some askoi of peculiar form, a vase with patterns, apparently of Corinthian fabric, and numerous objects of bronze, mostly personal ornaments.<sup>4</sup>

*Rome*.—Reg. viii. Remains of a private house with walls of unburnt brick have come to light. It contains a pavement of various coloured marbles arranged in chequers, below which was found another pavement. One of the party-walls was richly painted in panels with pilasters and cornice, one of the panels containing a life-like representation of a stag. The house abutted on the Servian wall near the Campus Martius, of which wall two courses of tufa stone were found. In the house were found pieces of white marble, porphyry, and serpentine, a carefully-modelled female figure from a terracotta cornice, and a terracotta female head with traces of colouring.<sup>6</sup>

From the Tiber a large rectangular block of travertine has been recovered with the names of Nero Claudius Drusus and T. Quinctius Drusus, consuls in B.C. 9. On a smaller base of travertine was the incised inscription: *Aesculapio | donum dat | lubens merito | M. Populicio M. F.* It refers to the temple of Aesculapius on the island in the Tiber. A third inscription was found relating to the college of the Frates Arvales: TI·CLAY[DI | P·MEMM[IVS REGVLVS...M | SILANV[S...T | 'SEXTIVS'A[FRICANVS] ...SALVIVS O[THO MAGISTER | CON]LEGI[F[RATRUM] A[RVALIVM]. The letter *a* belongs to the time of Claudius, so that it is possible to supply the names with certainty.<sup>3</sup>

Reg. iii. Near S. Pietro in Vincoli has been found a wall of unburnt brick, also a fragment of stucco with a representation of Pegasus in red on a white ground.

On the Aventine an ancient *cuniculus* has been excavated, with stuccoed walls, on one side of which is a passage with walls of tufa worked in *opus reticulatum*. On the other side are remains of chambers and buildings, and a pavement of *opus spicatum*. Two ancient drains came to light, covered with two-foot tiles stamped M·ANNITHOANTIS. Further to the south were walls of unburnt brick lined with marble, and a chamber with two recesses divided by a pilaster; in the chamber was a mosaic pavement with representations of Orpheus with his lyre surrounded by various animals, and a Centaur assailed by wild beasts. A bath was found, also two pieces

of stone one with the stamp of the potter Terentianus (C.I.L. xv. 624), the other stamped DOL·EX·FIG·TVBLIANIS | ARVNTI FELICIS... (cf. C.I.L. xv. 624). The fourth word should be *Publianus*.<sup>4</sup>

Among other discoveries in Reg. viii. is a seated statuette representing Fortune or Abundance, on the plinth of which is incised: (1) PER VOCE[M] PEGASI SACERDOT[IS]; (2) SANCTO DEO SABAZI | ATTIA CELERINA·D. A similar inscription was found here in 1889; the form Sabazi in each case shows that the nominative is Sabazis. Other objects: a fragment of a *τραπεζοφόρος* with a tiger's head; a marble statuette representing Heracles and the lion; a marble plinth with feet of two figures; pieces of stamped tiles, one of which is inscribed OP·D·EX PRAE[D·AVG·N·FIG· | OCEA]NAS MAIORE[s (cf. C.I.L. xv. 371)]; architectural fragments, including a sarcophagus with reliefs; a veiled female head, perhaps Augusta, and heads of Venus and Socrates.<sup>5</sup>

*Castelforte*.—Some *thermae*, the existence of which was previously known, have now been brought to light. The chief apartment is a large hall or tetra-style atrium, paved with slabs of white marble; in the centre is a large rectangular basin reached by four steps, lined with stucco. Another chamber had a marble pavement with *suspensurae*, and walls lined with tufa; this must have been the *tepidarium* or *calidarium*. The *praefurnium* was found in the place where Vitruvius (v. 10, 2) directs that it should be placed. Among the objects found were a marble statuette of a child seated on a rock, a marble lion's head pierced for a jet of water, and a youthful female head in marble.<sup>5</sup>

#### SICILY.

*Syracuse*.—On the line of an ancient road, probably the ὁδὸς Ἐλωρίης of Thucydides, remains of various dates have been brought to light, mostly tombs, ranging from the tenth century before Christ to the fifth after. Dr. Orsi has here excavated a subterranean chamber of the Hellenistic age, reached by steps. The vault and walls are covered with white stucco of marble dust, the floor is composed of various materials. Originally a tomb, it was plundered in antiquity and apparently used again as a wayside tavern, judging from the inscriptions and sketches on the walls. The burnt corpses were placed in fictile urns in niches, in one case in a sarcophagus. In the east wall is a large oven-like niche containing a skeleton, fragments of an olla with burnt bones, six lamps, etc. It is inscribed

(1) ΜΕΓΑΛΛΙΔΟΣ ΣΩΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ;  
(2) ΧΡΥΣΙΟΥ ΦΙΛΙΚΟΥ, in letters of about 200 B.C. In the south wall are niches inscribed ΧΥΡCIC, ΛΥΚΙΣΚΟΥ, ΑΓΗΣΙΛΑ, and ΚΡΑΤΕΙΑΣ, also a large sarcophagus; in the west wall others inscribed ΑΡΙΣΤΑΓΟΡΑ ΦΙΛΙΞΩ, ΧΡΥΣΙΩΝ and ΜΕΦΑΜΙC (Μέγαλλης?). On this latter wall is inscribed Ἡρακλίδας Νυμφιδόραν φιλεῖ, and below are sketched two heads in charcoal. On the right is a similar head of a youth, well executed, and a sketch of a building, apparently a peripteral temple. On a broken amphora, evidently from the later occupation, is inscribed ΦΛΑ·Α·ΤΙ (Flavianum, or Flaminianum, annorum duo).<sup>3</sup>

*Ragusa* (anciently Hybla Heraia). Dr. Orsi gives an account of the discoveries made by him in 1891 in ancient sepulchres, containing tombs of three types. In the first, which were Greek, were found

<sup>4</sup> *Notizie dei Lincei*, Sept. 1892.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* July, 1892.

two large amphorae painted in imitation of triglyphs and metopes; the style is geometric, but it is more probably of Sicilian than Greek fabric. Several Greek skyphoi with black figures were found, also a bronze jug, and a patera with guilloche border, the handle ending in a goose's head and lion's mask. In one of the tombs of the second type was found a fine black-figured kylix with eyes and figures of Seleni outside, and a Gorgoneion in the centre; in the third were no finds of interest.<sup>4</sup>

## GREECE.

*Mycenae*.—To the seven beehive-shaped tombs that were previously known, an eighth may now be added, which has been discovered between the tomb of Klytemnestra and the Acropolis. The *spûos* is cut out of the rock and partly lined with a wall of small stones joined with mortar; its breadth is 5·7 metres. The entrance to the tomb is constructed of carefully hewn stones, and the jambs of the doorway have been lined with four large slabs, of which the outer one is gone.<sup>6</sup>

H. B. WALTERS.

*Athenische Mittheilungen*. Part 3, 1892.

1. Pernice publishes a vase of geometric style from Athens; it represents a transitional stage between the latest Dipylon and the oldest 'early Attic' vases; discusses details of subject and ornament; 'if we can determine a continuous development in the history of these fabrics, we must conclude either that the Dipylon vases, this vase, and the early Attic are one and all un-Attic, or one and all Attic; there is no need to say which conclusion is the right one': plate and several cuts. 2. Ziehen; studies in Asklepios-reliefs; (i.) Representations of Asklepios visiting the sick, and analogous scenes. (ii.) The type of head assigned to Asklepios in Attic reliefs. (iii.) Asklepios and a Hero-physician: eight cuts. 3. Dörpfeld; discusses the different Odeia at Athens: the first Odeion built at Athens was that of Perikles, and all the pre-Roman writers refer to it as *the* Odeion, as if there had been only one building of the kind: it lay near the Dionysos-theatre at the S.E. foot of the Akropolis: destroyed 86 B.C., it lost its original name; and the term Odeion was applied to a little covered theatre which Agrippa built some years later: when, soon after, Herodes Attikos built his theatre, these two Odeia were called respectively Agrippaion and Herodes-Odeion: whether the Perikles Odeion was still used as such, we do not know; at any rate, these three were the only Odeia which Athens ever had. 4. Mayer; discusses Pliny's statements (xxxv. 39 and xxxiv. 69) as to the 'Thespiades' of Praxiteles; this term, if not directly to be rendered as 'Muses' indicates a type (like Vitruvius Caryatides), viz. the class of statues, varying in number and conception, in the Tanagra manner and the like. 5. The same; Paus. i. 2, 4 describes a relief 'Amphiktyon king of Athens entertaining Dionysos and other gods.' This is clearly one of the well-known types like the Dionysos-Ikarios relief: discusses also the Akrotaphos passage, *ibid.* 6. Pernice; publishes two sepulchral inscriptions recently found in Athens. 7. Kern; publishes a cut of a relief representing a sacrifice to a Hero, from Magnesia.

<sup>6</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 4 March, 1893.

Bibliography. Dörpfeld; report on discoveries (Athens, Sacred way to Eleusis, Eleusis, Corinth, Mycenae, Epidauros; in the theatre of Sikyon he traces under the front wall of the Roman proskenion the foundation of an earlier wooden proskenion, with holes for wooden posts etc. 'That this provisional wooden wall, corresponding to the notices of Vitruvius, was about 10 to 12 ft. high, is absolutely confirmed by the presence of two side ramps hewn out of the rock, which undoubtedly date from the earliest period of the theatre. In later times the wooden wall was replaced by a massive wall of opus incertum.' Delphi.) C. S.

*Römische Mittheilungen*. Rome. Part 1, 1892.

1. Mau gives his current account of the excavations at Pompeii; among the discoveries of interest is that of a fragment of fine mosaic work (in *Insula* viii. 2), with a spirited composition representing a girl being carried off in a biga: Theseus with Helena or (more probably) one of the Dioskuri with a Leukippid: a sketch is given, p. 13. In *Insula* v. 2 are given a quantity of minor inscriptions from walls and varia supellex: among others two hexameters; 'Barbara barbaribus barabant barbara barbis'; and 'Restitutus multas deceptis sepe puellas.' 2. Marx; the figure on the mosaic in the Casa del Fauno hitherto called the 'genio di Baeco' or 'Akratos' is really, as a comparison with the Monnus mosaic (*Ant. Denk.* i. 47) shows, a personification of Autumn; and the four triclinia of the Casa were arranged to suit each season in turn. 3. Petersen; publishes the reliefs described *Bull. Com.* xv. p. 267 &c.; discusses this type of Aphrodite anadyomene in connection with literary notices of the Pheidias and Apelles types and the silver relief published in *Gaz. Arch.* 1879, pl. 19: considers the two side figures represent an hetaira and a bride, in the well-known antithesis of sacred and profane love; the throne to which these belong must have supported a cult-statue of Aphrodite, of which the head is probably that published in *Mon. Ined.* x. 1: this Aphrodite is probably the Erucina of the porta Collina: photographic plate and various cuts. 4. Bloch; publishes an athlete statue of the Uffizi gallery which has been wrongly restored; it originally represented a figure pouring oil: plate and cuts. 5. Petersen; the so-called Medusa Ludovisi has been identified as a sleeping Erinyes: this is borne out by further facts on examination of the restoration: cut.

Meetings of the Institute.

C. S.

*The same*. Part 2, 1892.

1. Mau; notes on the 'edifizio di Eumachia' at Pompeii; studies the details of the architecture and suggests a restoration: the building was intended for commerce in wool stuffs or clothing in general, such as the dyers who dedicated the statue of Eumachia there would have had an interest in: plan and cuts. 2. Dressel; an examination of the originals of the Passeri 'Lucornae fictiles' shows that many of them, and especially those noted for the richness and unusual character of the designs, are false: examines these lamps in detail. 3. Fuehrer; the Passio S. Philippi in the Acta Martyrum refers to the burning of an armata Minerva, which from the context and other evidence must refer to the Athene Parthenos of Pheidias; coupling this with the well-known episode in the Proklos of Marinos, we see that the statue was destroyed by fire about 435 A.D., or at any rate between 429—485 A.D.; and this would explain why after the fifth century we do not

meet with a single trace of its subsequent history. 4. Meyer; republishes a bronze statuette in Florence restored as a Kronos; it was originally either an Hephaistos or a Ulysses: cut. 5. Mau; Bibliographia Pompeiana. 5. Petersen; discoveries in Sicily (Megara, Syracuse, Gela, Selinus), Ancona, Rome, S. Bernardo. C. S.

*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique.* Athens and Paris. September—November, 1892.

1. Holleaux; publishes four photographic plates of fragments of bronze bands with archaic reliefs similar to those found at Dodona and Olympia &c.; these bands come from the excavations at the Ptoion: the similarity of style and, in three instances, identity of subject show that all are traceable to the same original Argive-Corinthian source: compares them in detail with Corinthian vase-paintings. 2. Doublet; publishes two new cleruchi decrees of Delos, discovered in 1889; each includes (i.) a decree of the Athenians of Delos, (ii.) a decree of the people of Athens. 3. Fontrier; the monastery of Lembos near Smyrna and its possessions in the 13th century. 4. S. Reinach; the sanctuary of Athena and of Zeus Meilichios at Athens; M. Fauvel found near Ambelokepoi certain remains including remains of an Ionic temple, and a cavern with two reliefs; from the name, he concluded that this was the site of the temple of Aphrodite *ἐν κήποις*: the name Ambelokepoi however is a survival, not of *ἐν κήποις* (which are probably to the S.E.) but of Alopekethen; in this quarter an inscription has been found 'in an ancient well' referring to a shrine of Zeus Meilichios and Athens: this was doubtless the shrine which Fauvel found, and the bas-reliefs bear this out; excavation on the site would be desirable. 5. Bérard; continues his publication of inscriptions of Asia Minor (nos. 39—97). 6. Collignon; publishes in heliogravure a male head recently acquired by the Louvre, of early Attic work. C. S.

*The same.* December, 1892.

1. Holleaux; notes on Boeotian epigraphy: chiefly on inscriptions found by him in the excavations at the Ptoion. 2. Giannopoulos; discusses the situation of the Phthiotic city Itonos. 3. Homolle; signatures of artists. (i.) an Athenian architect at Delos: restores from five fragments the inscription on the architrave of one of the temples consecrated to stranger divinities; the architect's name is Apollodoros, his date is 140 B.C. (ii.) Hephaistion son of Myron, an Athenian (*C.I.G.* 2293, refound at Delos): the object in question is dated to 128 B.C. 4. Lechat; continues his articles on the archaic statues of Athens (*ante* 1892, pp. 177—213). 5. Bérard; Tegea and the Tegeatid; (i.) Geography and Topography; (ii.) Demes; (iii.) the Town; with five Greek inscriptions: plan. 6. Couve; publishes a marble base (pl. iii. and vii.) which was noted in the *Bulletin* 1891, p. 369, signed by Bryaxis: concludes that the reliefs of this base belong to the early period of the artist; they show especial care in the treatment of the horses, which is an important fact in view of this artist's share in the Mausoleum sculptures. 7. Holleaux; publishes an archaic statue found at Melos: this statue forms a link whereby the Apollo of Thera may be added to the group which Sauer ascribes to Naxos: plate. 8. Fougères; publishes the archaic inscription from Mantinea noted *Bulletin* xi. p. 419, giving a list of debtors of Alea, i.e. Athene Alea, followed by a text of uncertain meaning; and a fragment of another inscription from the Bouleuterion of the same site.

9. Homolle gives some complementary notes on the preceding inscriptions: he thinks both form part of one and the same document, referring to an attempted sacrilege, and the murder of several people. C. S.

*Porträtköpfe auf römischen Münzen der Republik und der Kaiserzeit.* By Dr. F. IMHOOF-BLUMER. Leipzig (Teubner) 1892. Second edition.

THIS very neat and useful volume first appeared in 1879. Though only a *pauvre* of its learned author, primarily intended for schools, it is compiled with all his well-known care, and ought not to be overlooked by classical scholars and archaeologists. The book consists of four large photographic plates displaying the portrait-heads of Emperors on 122 Roman coins. The accompanying pages of text (1—16) give a list of the Emperors (to Romulus Augustulus) with their dates and titles and some explanatory notes. Only a single portrait of each Emperor is represented, but Dr. Imhoof-Blumer's choice is always judicious. Portraits of Emperors—for instance of Nero, M. Aurelius and Caracalla—at different stages of life would have been very interesting, but considerations of cost precluded—and no doubt rightly—a more extensive selection of coins.

In the present edition some additions and corrections have been made in the text and notes. There seem to be no changes in the Plates, which, executed by Brunner and Hauser of Zurich, are admirable specimens of numismatic photography.

WARWICK WROTH.

*Numismatic Chronicle.* Part 4, 1892. Review of Muret's *Catalogue des Monnaies gauloises de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, by Sir John Evans.

*Numismatische Zeitschrift.* (Vienna), Vol. xxiii. 1891.

J. von Schlosser, 'Kleinasiatische und thrakische Münzbilder der Kaiserzeit.' Rare Greek Imperial coins arranged according to types. *Zeus of Laodicea and Personifications of Phrygia and Caria* on coin of Laodicea in Phrygia. *Statue of Hera of Samos* on coin of Minoa in Amorogos. Amorogos was colonized by Samians, and at Minoa festivals named 'Hpaia were celebrated. *Hephaistos.* Coin of Magnesia ad Maeandrum representing four workmen carrying a statue of Hephaistos, probably at a guild-festival of which the god was patron. *Herakles Ipoktonos* on coin of Erythrae in Ionia, where a statue of the god existed. *Representations of Aphrodite* on coins of Bithynia etc. *Argos building the ship Argo* on coin of Nicomedia. *Coins of Amastria.*—B. Pick. 'Inedita der Sammlung Mandl in Budapest.' Greek Imperial coins chiefly of Moesia and Thrace, in the collection of Mr. Karl Mandl, many of them from a find in Roumania. Dr. Pick gives a good list of Roman magistrates whose names appear on the coins of Marcianopolis and Nicopolis.—B. Pick, 'Zwei neue Medaillons von Thyateira.' Two large bronze coins of the reigns of Severus Alexander and Maximinus. They bear representations of Helios holding the double axe of the local divinity Tyrimnos. This god is referred to in *C.I.G.* 3500:—*ἱερεὺς τοῦ προπάτορος θεοῦ ἡλίου θεοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος Τυριμαίου* (cp. *C.I.G.* 3497, *ἱερεὺς τοῦ προπάτορος θεοῦ Τυριμῶν*).—J. Hampel, 'Ein Münzfund aus Bregetio.' A find of Roman aurei of Numerian and Diocletian; gold medallions of Maximian Hercules, etc.—F. Kenner, 'Nachtrag zu dem Münzfunde aus Bregetio.'—M. Bahrfeldt, 'Ueber die Münzen der römischen Republik in der grossherzoglich Badischen Münz-



sammlung zu Karlsruhe.'—J. Scholz, 'Bericht über eines Auzahl beim Baue des k.k. Kunst-historischen Hofmuseums ausgegrabener Münzen.'—Review of Wroth's *Coins of Mysia*, by Dr. Julius v. Schlosser.' W. WROTH.

*Zeitschrift für Numismatik.* Berlin. Parts 3 and 4, 1892.

A. von Sallet, 'Die Erwerbungen des Königlichen Münzcabinets vom 1 April 1889 bis 1 April 1890.' The acquisitions include 38 Greek and 17 Roman coins. Among the coins described is the silver piece of 'Aerme-naos' a supposed Macedonian king. Dr. von Sallet first published this coin in the preface to his *Beschreibung*, vol. ii., and he now attempts to defend it from the various attacks that have been made on its authenticity. I regret that I am still of opinion that the coin is false. Dr. von Sallet has probably not seen a silver coin sent to London a few months ago from Constantinople: this specimen is from the same reverse-die as the Aerme-naos coin, but its obverse purports to be of Terone and bears as type a poorly executed and obviously modern amphora. This forgery was brought for examination

to the British Museum and an electrotype of it is now in the collection. I may add that the 'Aerme-naos' coin originally came from Constantinople: on being offered to the British Museum, it was declined as false.—*Zacynthus*. Stater with reverse, Infant and two serpents (cp. Brit. Mus. Cat. *Pelop.* Zacynthus, 22). This type is usually explained as Herakles strangling serpents, but Dr. von Sallet remarks (at the suggestion of Prof. Robert and Dr. Dressel) that the infant is not strangling but fondling the serpents, and that he is probably therefore the infant Asklepios. This seems a possible but somewhat hazardous explanation.—*Mallus* (Cilicia). Colonial coin with legend SACRA (sic) SENATVS i.e. IEPA CYNKAHTOC.—*Achulla*. Bronze coin with the head of P. Quinctilius Varus, Proconsul of Africa.—Rare aurei of Laelianus, Nigrinianus, and Alexander (A.D. 311). 'Die Silber-Münzprägungen während des letzten Aufstandes der Israeliten gegen Rom, von Leopold Hamburger nach einem in der Nähe von Chebron gemachten Münzfunde classificirt.' Important for the chronology of Jewish coins. W. WROTH.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

**Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin.** June.—August 1891.

HERODOTUS BY H. KALLENBERG.

I. Editions and text-criticisms. *Herodotos* by H. Stein, vol. iv. book vii. 5th ed. Berlin 1889. With every new edition the text and notes are thoroughly revised. 'Hρόδóτου ιστορίαι', H. van Herwerden. Vol. iv. containing books viii. and ix. with index. Traj. ad Rhen. 1889. Herodots Zweites Buch with elucidations by A. Weidmann. Leipzig 1890. The writer is more copious than Sayce, and deserves the thanks of all Egyptologists. *Herodoti de bello Persico librorum epitome* with select parts from books i.—iv. by A. Wilhelm, new edition by F. Lanczizky, Wien 1888. The selections show good judgment. *Die Wiener Handschrift des Herodot*, by K. Abicht. Progr. Öls, 1888. Supports the opinion of Gomperz that the MSS. family Rsv is more trustworthy than ABC. *Quaestiones Herodoteae*, by E. Schwartz, Ind. lect. Rostock 1890. On i. 57, 147, ix. 106, and iv. 45.

II. Dialect and Syntax. *De particulae & usu Herodoto*, by G. Thomas. Diss. Leipzig 1888. *De sermone Thucydidis quatenus cum Herodoto congruens differat a scriptoribus Atticis*, by O. Diener. Diss. Leipzig 1889. Shows extraordinary diligence. *Das praesens historicum bei Herodot und Thukydides*, by K. Th. Rodemeyer. Diss. Basel 1889. Does not explain all the instances satisfactorily. *Ueber den Genetivus bei Herodot*, by F. Stourac. Progr. Olmütz 1888. Careful and thorough. *Zur Attraction der Relativsätze in der griechischen Prosa*, by K. Reisert. Part I. Herodotus. Progr. Neustadt a. d. Haardt 1889. More complete than any previous writing on the subject. The work will extend to Thucydides, the Attic orators, Xenophon, Plato, and the Attic inscriptions. *Die Rhetorik bei Herodot und De genere dicendi Herodoteo quaestiones selectae*, by P. Kleber. Progr. Löwenberg 1889, 1890. Aims to show that H.'s language is more adapted for hearers than readers, yet that it is

artistically framed. *Zum Vokalismus des herodotischen Dialektes*, by A. Fritsch. Progr. Hamburg 1888. By the help of the Ionic inscriptions the nouns in *ηιο* (= *evē*) and *ειο* which answer to the Attic in *ειο* are exhaustively treated. *De dialect. Ionica recentiore*, by H. Lindemann. Diss. Kiel, 1889. Though treating primarily of Lucian, Arrian and others, this is also concerned with Herodotus.

III. Geography and History, Sources and Trustworthiness. *La géographie d'Hérodote*, by Am. Hauvette. Rev. de phil. xiii. Herodotus' method a reaction against the geography of his time. *L'Afrique secondo Erodoto*, by L. Hugues. Turin 1890. *Landeskunde von Agypten nach Herodot*, by W. Rudkowski. Diss. Halle 1888. The information of H. is viewed in the light of present knowledge. *Herodots Angaben über die Nilländer oberhalb Syenes*, by E. Sparig. Diss. Halle 1889. *Landeskunde von Skythien nach Herodot*, by C. Reichardt. Diss. Halle 1889. *Das Skythenland nach Herodot*, by C. Krauth, N. Jahr. f. Phil. 1890. *Der historische Wert der griechischen Berichte über Cyrus und Cambyzes*, by E. Evers. Progr. Berlin 1888. *Herodot über die Ionier und Die Pelasger in Attika und Lemnos*, by Ed. Meyer. Philol. xlviii. *Le plongeur Scyllias de Scioné d'après Hérodote et Pausanias*, by Am. Hauvette. Rev. de phil. x. Scyllias is made out to be a historical person. *La véracité d'Hérodote*, by A. Croiset. Revue des études grecques 1888. A defence against Sayce's assertions that H. was never in Babylon and never in Elephantine. *Hérodote et les Ionians*, by Am. Hauvette. Revue des études grecques 1888. Finds grounds for H.'s prejudice against the Ionians in his admiration of Athens and reverence for Delphi. *Zur Geschichte der griechischen Prosa*, by E. Maass. Hermes xxii. Seeks to show that Hdt. iii. 80—82 comes from the Sophists. *Die Memoiren des Dikaaios*, by Trantwein. Hermes xxv. Denies that Hdt. viii. 65 foll. can be from Dikaaios himself. *Inter Scyllaeum Caryandensem et Herodotum quae sit ratio*, by R. Issberner.

Diss. Berlin 1888. Seeks to show that there is no doubt that Scylax wrote a book about India and that he is H.'s authority for India.

IV. Writings of various contents. *Studia Herodotea*, by J. Maclaren. Inaugural-Diss. von Rostoch. Oxford 1888. Answers three questions (1) What were the limits of kingly power among the Persians? (2) Did the Persians contemplate a world-empire? (3) What was the real religion of the Persians? *Ueber die Reihenfolge und Zeit der Abfassung des herodotischen Geschichtswerks*, by E. Ammer. Progr. Stranburg 1888. An attempt to decide the order of composition from internal evidence. *Der sogenannte Neid der Götter bei Herodot.*, by H. Meuss. Progr. Leignitz 1888. *Analyse herodoteische Reden*, by J. Sausser. Progr. Salzburg 1889. *Die Bekanntheit römischer Schriftsteller mit Herodot.*, by H. Ball. Progr. Berlin 1898. Concludes that in the time of the Republic Herodotus was scarcely read by the Romans. *Zu Herodot. v. 77*, by H. Kirchhoff. Sitzungsber. der Akad. der Wiss. Berlin 1887. *Die Gründung von Naukratis*, Rhein. Mus. 1887 and *Zu den Inschriften von Naukratis*, Rhein. Mus. 1889, by G. Hirschfeld. Declares for Hdt. ii. 178 in preference to Strabo p. 801. *Observationes de Herodoti loco ad antiquitates sacras spectante*, by W. Dittenberger. Ind. Schol. Halle 1890. Takes δεκατέσσαρι in vii. 132 to refer to a destruction of the state.

V. Scattered contributions. H. Diels on i. 200, Hermes xxiii. Sihler on viii. 124, Am. J. Ph. ix. [cf. Cl. Rev. iii. 144], H. Diels, *Thales ein Semit?* Archiv f. d. Gesch. der Philos. i. Ig. Thác, Zu Herodot. iii. 14, Zeitschr. f. d. öst. G. 1889, also on the same H. Sauppe. *Quaest. crit.* Ind. lec. Göttingen 1886. H. Usener, on i. 67 [cf. Cl. Rev. iv. 329] N. Jahrb. f. Phil. 1889. Iconomopoulos, *Les jeux gymniques de Panopolis* on ii. 89. Revue des études grecques 1889. Berndt, *Kritische Bemerkungen zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern*, Herford 1890, on ix. 56 and 57. F. D. Allen on vi. 57, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 1890.

**Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Pädagogik.** Ed. Fleckeisen u. Masius (Leipzig). 1892.

Heft 10 contains (1) H. Welzhofer *Zur Gesch. der Perserkriege* on the fight at Thermopylae. (2) M. Wellmann, *Zur gesch. der Medicin im altertum*, a brief account of what is known of Straton, Aetios Sikamios, Hikesios, Hermogenes, Charidemos, Apollonios, Antipatros and other physicians, mostly of the school of Erasistratus. (3) A Fuchs *Die plethora bei Erasistratus*, the origin, symptoms and cure of plethora, according to the school of Erasistratus. (4) W. Schmid *Ein epistolographisches übungstück unter den Pariser papyri*, an interesting paper on certain school-exercises in letter-writing preserved on *σελίδες* 8, 9, 11, 12 of the papyrus published by Brunet de Presle, *Notices et Extraits des MSS. de la Bibliothèque Impériale* xviii. 2 pp. 47—75, 360—374. (5) W. H. Roscher *Die schattenlosigkeit des Zeus-abatons auf dem Lykaion*, contending that the myth concerning the absence of shadow in the *τέμενος* was a relic of an earlier myth which identified Lycaeus with Olympus. (6) W. Sternkopf *Ciceros correspondenz aus den jahren 59 u. 58*, an attempt to arrange the letters in chronological order. (7) P. Loebe *Zu Ov. Heroides 8*, 103 proposing *eminus a! nus bis diruta Troia ferit*.

Heft 11 contains (1) H. Welzhofer *Zur gesch. der Perserkriege* on the naval battles at Artemision and the capture of Athens. (2) F. Susemihl *Zum roman der Alexandrinerzeit* a discussion of inferences drawn from Cic. *de inv.* i. 19, 27 and *Auctor ad Her.* i. 8, 12 f. (3) M. C. P. Schmidt *ἔρα = Stunde*,

pointing out that 'Αθ. πολιτεία c. 30 is the earliest passage in which ἔρα is used in the sense of 'hour.' (4) H. Lewy *Einiges über Τόχη*, various notes, the most interesting of which is that a ladder is commonly used on Lucanian and Apulian vases as a symbol of Fortune. (5) L. Paul *Das Druidentum*, an elaborate collection of the relevant passages in Latin authors.

Heft 12 contains (1) A. Scotland: *das zwanzigste buch der Odyssee*, a very elaborate discussion of supposed interpolations. (2) E. Lange *die bedeutung von ἀρετή bei Thukyd.*, contending, against Müller-Strübing, that Thuc. regards ἀρετή in almost the Platonic way, viz. as comprising ἀνδρεία, σωφροσύνη, δικαιοσύνη and φρόνησις. (3) W. Drexler *Miscellanea*, ranging from epigraphy to the mythology of the rainbow. (4) J. Lange *Zu Cornelius Nepos*, emendations. (5) R. Gütze *Zu den Lateinischen panegyrikern*, emendations.

1893. Heft 1 contains G. Friedrich *Zum panegyrikos des Isocrates*, contending that it was first published in 385 or early in 384, whereas Blass assigns it to 380 B.C. (2) H. v. Kleist *Zu Thuk.* various notes and emendations. (3) O. Crusius *Zur topographie von Alexandria*, maintaining, against W. Schwarz, that Juliopolis and Nicopolis are the same place, a suburb of Alexandria. (4) F. Susemihl, notice of E. Maass, *Aratea* (Weidmann), said to assist our knowledge of Alexandrian literature 'more than almost any work except Meineke's *Analecta Alexandrina*, Diels's *Doxographi* and Wilamowitz's *Antigonos*.' (5) J. Franke *Der angriff des M. Lepidus u. M. Brutus auf das reformwerk Sullas*, contending, against recent historians, that this attack took place after Sulla's death. (6) A. Nehring *Bidens hostia*, an interesting note, correcting Georges and Freund (also Lewis and Short) s.v. *bidens*. A sheep or ox has no incisors on the upper jaw. On the lower jaw, it has at first a set of milk-teeth, which begin to fall away, in pairs, after the eighteenth month, and are replaced by a second and larger set. A *bidens* is an animal which has the two central incisors of the second set, and is therefore about two years old. The name *bidens* is occasionally applied, by analogy, to a two-year-old pig, though it is not usual to judge the age of pigs by the teeth.

**Rivista di Filologia.** Ed. Comparetti, Müller e Flechia, 1892—3.

Fasc. 1—3 contain (1) G. Turiello *Sui composti syntattici nelle lingue classiche*, contending in effect that syntactic compounds are of late origin, and did not exist in the original Indo-European language. (2) C. Nigra, *Inni di Callimaco su Diana e sui lavacri di Pallade*, conclusion, giving a collection of MSS. scholia and notes. (4) G. de Sanctis *La battaglia dell' Eurimedonte in Diodoro*, maintaining that the date assigned by Diodorus (B.C. 470—69) is probably correct. (5) L. Valmaggia *Tablifer*, showing that this word is probably the title of the soldier who, in a triumph, carried the list of *oppida capta* (Ovid *Tristia* v. 20, Prop. iii. 4, 16).

Fasc. 4—7 contain (1) C. O. Zuretti, *An obituary notice of Giovanni Flechia*, joint editor of the *Rivista* since 1874. He was born Nov. 16th 1811. and died July 3rd 1892. (2) F. Scerbo, *Questiti di lingua america*, chiefly on the epic use of *ei*, *ov* for *e*, *o*, and on the doubling of consonants. (3) V. Pantoni, *Sull' inno ad Ecate nella Teogonia esiodea*, vv. 404—452. (4) A. Nieri, *La Cirenaica nel secolo quinto giusta le lettere di Sinesio*, a very long historical article. (5) G. Fraccaroli, *La terza e quarta ode nemea*, discussion of contents with verse-translation. (6) V. Costanzi, *Spigolature aristoteliche*, discussions of the historical problems raised by 'Αθ. πολιτεία.

Fasc. 7-9 contain (1) G. Müller *An obituary notice of E. Loescher*, publisher of the Rivista, who died in Nov. 1892. (2) C. O. Zuretti *Sul  $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota$  τῆς  $\rho\omega\mu\alpha\iota\omega\nu$  τύχης di Plutarco*, chiefly a collection of evidence for the authenticity of the work. (3) L. Valmaggì *La fortuna di Stazio nella tradizione*

*letteraria latina e bassolatina*, the first part of an inquiry into the traditions about Statius held in the Middle Ages. (4) L. Levi *De gli onori funebri resi in Atene ai cittadini caduti in battaglia*, an account of the proceedings, with a criticism founded on Plato *Menczenus* 234 C-235 C.

## LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

## ENGLISH BOOKS.

*Euripides*. Electra. With Introduction, Notes, &c. by C. H. Keene. 8vo. Bell & Son. 10s. 6d.  
*Herodotus*. VIII. 1-90 (Artemisium and Salamis). With Introduction and Notes by E. S. Shuckburgh. 12mo. Pp. 172. Cambridge Warehouse. 2s. 6d.  
 — IX. 1-89 (Plataea). With Introduction and Notes by E. S. Shuckburgh. 12mo. Pp. 198. Cambridge Warehouse. 2s. 6d.  
 — Book VIII. A Vocabulary and Test Papers. Crown 8vo. Sewed. Clive. 1s.  
 — Book VIII. Text and Notes. Crown 8vo. Clive. 3s. 6d.  
 — Book VIII. Edited by J. Thompson and R. M. Thomas. Post 8vo. Clive. 5s. 6d.  
*Hine* (M. C.) An Introduction to Latin Prose Composition. Post 8vo. Pp. 162. Simpkin. 1s. 6d. net. Key, 6d. net.

*Homer*. Iliad. Done into English by George Chapman. 3 vols. 24mo. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 13s. 6d.  
*Thompson* (E. Maunde). A Manual of Greek and Latin Palaeography. Crown 8vo. Kegan Paul & Co. 5s.  
*Tacitus*. Histories. Book I. A Vocabulary and Test Papers. Crown 8vo. Sewed. Clive. 1s.  
 — Book I. Text and Notes. Crown 8vo. Clive. 3s. 6d.  
 — Histories. Book I. Translation by F. G. Plaistowe and H. J. Maidment. Crown 8vo. Sewed. Clive. 1s. 6d.  
 — Histories. Book I. Edited by F. G. Plaistowe and H. J. Maidment. Post 8vo. Clive. 5s. 6d.

## FOREIGN BOOKS.

*Belger* (C.) Die mykenische Lokalsage von den Gräbern Agamemnons und der Seinen im Zusammenhang der griechischen Sagenentwicklung. Mit einer Rekonstruktion des Schliemannschen Gräbergrundes und sieben Plänen. Progr. Berlin 93. 42 S. m. 8 Figuren. 4to.  
*Bergmann* (A.) Einleitung in Ciceros Rede für L. Valerius Flaccus. Progr. Schneeberg 93. 21 S. 4to.  
*Bishop* (C. E.) Verbals in - $\tau\omicron\varsigma$  in Sophocles. III. S. A. 92. 14 S. 8vo.  
*Burggraefe* (A.) Études sur Hippocrate au point de vue de la méthode dosimétrique. 2ième édition considérablement augmentée. 8vo. xxxvi, 767 pp. Paris. Carré.  
 Catalogue des monnaies grecques de la Bibliothèque nationale. Les Perses Achéménides, les Satrapes et les Dynastes tributaires de leur Empire (Cypre et Phénicie) par E. Babelon. 8vo. cxciv, 418 pp. Plates. Paris. Rollin et Feuerdent.  
*Czyckiewicz* (A.) Untersuchungen zur zweiten Hälfte der Odyssee, (Buch xiii. und xvii.-xxiv.) Progr. Brody 92. 53 S. 8vo.  
*Deecke* (W.) Lateinische Schulgrammatik. 8vo. viii, 300 pp. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 2 Mk. 40. Erläuterungen dazu. 8vo. iv, 477 pp. 4 Mk. 80.  
 Dissertationes philologiae Vindobonenses. Vol. IV. 8vo. iv, 203 pp. Wien. C. Gerold's Sohn. 4 Mk.

*Dressler* (F. R.) Triton und die Tritonen in der Litteratur und Kunst der Griechen und Römer. Teil I. and II. Progr. 4to. v, 33 and iii, 47 pp. Wurzen. 2 Mk. 40.  
*Ebe* (G.) Die Schmuckformen der Denkmalsbauten aus allen Stilepochen seit der griechischen Antike. In 8 Teilen. Teil I. and II. Antike und alt-christliche Zeit. 4to. 50 pp. Illustrations and plates. Berlin. G. Siemens. 6 Mk. 40.  
*Euripides*. Electre. Texte grec, accompagné d'une notice, d'un argument analytique, de notes en français, par H. Weil. 16mo. 107 pp. Paris. Hachette & Cie. 1 Fr.  
*Falbrecht* (F.) De tertio Andriae exitu, quem exhibet Codex Erlangensis CCC. Dissertatio. Wien 93. 38 S. 8vo.  
*Flensburg* (N.) Ueber Ursprung und Bildung des Pronomens  $\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$ . 8vo. 69 pp. Lund, Möller. 1 Mk. 40.  
*Furtwängler* (A.) G. Körte, A. Milchhofer, Archäologische Studien, ihrem Lehrer H. Brunn zur Feier seines 50 jähr. Doctorjubiläums am 20 März 1893 in dankbarer Verehrung dargebracht. 4to. iii, 91 pp. Plates. Berlin, G. Reimer. Boards. 15 Mk.  
*Goetz* (G.) De Astrabae Plantinae fragmentis commentatio. Progr. Jena 93. 8 S. 4to.  
*Groebe* (P.) De legibus et senatusconsultis anni 710 quaestiones chronologicae. Dissertatio. Berlin 93. 48 S. 8vo.

- Guhl und Koner.* Leben der Griechen und Römer. 6te Auflage herausgegeben von R. Engelmann (in 18 Lieferungen) Lieferung 1. 8vo. 80 pp. Illustrations. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 Mk.
- Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft herausgegeben von Iwan Müller. Band IV. Abth. 2. 8vo. München, C. H. Beck.
- [Die römischen Staats und Kriegsalterthümer von H. Schiller. Die römischen Privatalterthümer von M. Voigt. 2te Auflage. 1x, 478 pp. 8 Mk.]
- Hergt (G.)* Die Nordlandfahrt des Pytheas. Dissertation. Halle 93. 78 S. und 1 Karte. 8vo.
- Hollaender (L.)* Kunaxa. Historisch-kritische Beiträge zur Erklärung von Xenophons Anabasis. Progr. Naumburg 93. 36 S. 4to.
- Jacobs (E.)* Thasiaca. 8vo. 51 pp. Plates. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 Mk.
- Joseph (D.)* Die Paläste des homerischen Epos mit Rücksicht auf die Ausgrabungen H. Schliemanns. 8vo. vii, 81 pp. Plate. Berlin, G. Siemens. 1 Mk. 40.
- Kopp (W.)* Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur. 5te Auflage nach der Umarbeitung von F. G. Hubert besorgt von L. H. Müller. 12mo. xii, 239 pp. Berlin, J. Springer. 3 Mk.
- Griechische Staatsalterthümer für höhere Lehranstalten und zum Selbststudium. 2te Auflage besorgt von V. Thumser. 12mo. x, 147 pp. Berlin, J. Springer. 2 Mk.
- Krause (K. C. F.)* Abriss der Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie. Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlasse des Verfassers herausgegeben von P. Hohlfeld und A. Wünsche. Mit einem Anhang: Die Philosophie der Kirchenväter und des Mittelalters. 8vo. viii, 100 pp. Leipzig, Felber. 2 Mk. 50.
- Kümpel (E.)* Die Quellen zur Geschichte des Krieges der Römer gegen Antiochus III. Progr. Hamburg 93. 32 S. 4to.
- Lang (M.)* Ueber die Leiblichkeit der Vernunftwesen bei Origines. Dissertation. Leipzig 92. 44 S. 8vo.
- Ludwich (A.)* Endociae Augustae carminum reliquiae editae ab F. L. Progr. Königsberg 93. 53 S. 4to.
- Meyer (E.)* Philologische Miscellen. I. Progr. Herford 93. 26 S. 8vo.
- Monumenta Germaniae historica inde ab anno Christi D usque ad annum MD edidit societas aperiendis fontibus rerum germanicarum medii aevi. Auctores antiquissimi. Tom. XI. Pars 1. 4to. Berlin, Weidmann. 8 Mk.
- [Chronica minora Saec. iv, v, vi, vii, edidit T. Mommsen. Vol. II. Fasc. 1. 239 pp. Plates.]
- Muellner (C.)* De imaginibus similitudinibusque, quae in Claudiani carminibus inveniuntur. Dissertation. Wien 93. 94 S. 8vo.
- Murr (J.)* Die Parusie der Gottheit in vegetativer Substanz. Vom Standpunkte der griechischen Mythologie betrachtet. 16mo. 23 pp. Innsbruck, Vereinsbuchhandlung. 36 pfg.
- Niese (B.)* Josephi epitomae adhuc ineditae pars sexta. Progr. Marburg 93. 57 S. 4to.
- Nindel (O.)* Kritische Bemerkungen zu Euripides. (Alcestis.) Progr. Bernburg 93. 20 S. 4to.
- Ohnefalsch-Richter (M.)* Kypros. Die Bibel und Homer. Beiträge zur Cultur-, Kunst- und Religionsgeschichte des Orients im Alterthume. 2 Bände. 4to. viii, 535 und 5 pp. Illustrations and Plates. Berlin, A. Asher & Co. Boards. 18 Mk.
- Overbeck (J.)* Geschichte der griechischen Plastik. 4te Auflage 2ter Halbband. 8vo. xii, 303—565 pp. Illustrations. Leipzig, Hinrichs. 6 Mk.
- Philonis mechanicae syntaxis libri IV. et V.* Recensuit R. Schoene. 8vo. xii, 96 pp. Berlin, G. Reimer. 2 Mk.
- Rönström (T. O. I.)* Metri Vergiliani recensio. 8vo. 61 pp. Lund, Möller. 1 Mk. 20.
- Schneider (G.)* Beiträge zur homerischen Wortforschung und Textkritik. Progr. 4to. 31 pp. Götting, K. Rother. 1 Mk.
- Schöne (A.)* Das historische Nationaldrama der Römer. Die Fabula praetexta. Gel. Kiel 93. 18 S. 8vo.
- Sigmund (C.)* De coincidentia eiusque usu Plautino et Terentiano. Dissertation. Wien 93. 60 S. 8vo.
- Sjöstrand (N.)* In Syntaxin Draegerianam notationes nonnullae. 8vo. 40 pp. Lund, Möller. 1 Mk.
- Staedler (K.)* Von Horaz-Verdeutschungen. Progr. Berlin 93. 18 S. 4to.
- Stahl (J. M.)* De Euegori lege disputatio. Progr. Münster 93. 20 S. 4to.
- Vaders (J.)* De alis exercitus Romani, quales erant imperatorum temporibus. Progr. Münster 93. 18 S. 4to.
- Vahlen (F.)* De Euripidis Hercule, quem furemtem dicere solebant. Progr. Berlin 93. 25 S. 4to.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (U. v.)* De tragicorum Graecorum fragmentis commentatio. Progr. Göttingen 93. 33 S. 8vo.
- Wintzell (K.)* De hellenismo Horatii quaestiones nonnullae. I. 8vo. 26 pp. Lund, Möller. 1 Mk. 20.